DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 760 PS 015 081

TITLE	Child Care: Beginning a National Initiative. Hearing before the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. House of Representatives, Ninety-Eighth Congress, Second Session (April 4, 1984).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, DC. House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families.
PUB DATE	84
NOTE	114p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC (Stock No. 052-070-059-66-4, $4.00).
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Zoning; *Day Care; Early Childhood Education; *Employed Parents; *Family Day Care; *Financial Support; Foreign Countries; *Government Role; Infants; *School Age Day Care; Toddlers
IDENTIFIERS	Europe; Family Policy; Latchkey Children; Maryland (Montgomery County)

ABSTRACT

This hearing concerns problems and solutions related to working parents' need for day care services. Testimony focuses on (1) research findings, social trends, and public issues related to the need for day care; (2) infant and toddler care, day care options, school-age day care, and latchkey children; (3) the need for public funding for day care services to low income working parents and the role of the private sector; (4) problems of working mothers in finding appropriate, quality care for their children; (5) the formation of Family Day Care Associations and issues related to family day care; (6) activities of organizations supporting mothers who choose to stay home; (7) myths about child care; (8) problems of finding adequate babysitting services; (9) regulation of family day care; and (10) innovative family policies in Europe. Included in the report are articles providing a national perspective on child care services, a discussion of demographic changes and working mothers' need for child care, and an amendment to the zoning ordinance for the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery County, Maryland, to increase the number of children who may be served by a child day care facility in residential zones and to allow child day care facilities as permitted uses in commercial and industrial zones. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PS

CHILD CARE: BEGINNING A NATIONAL INITIATIVE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED261760

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C. ON
APRIL 4, 1984

Printed for the use of the
Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families

PS015081

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
36-292 O WASHINGTON : 1984

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES

GEORGE MILLER, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM LEHMAN, Florida
PATRICIA SCHROEDER, Colorado
LINDY BOGGS, Louisiana
MATTHEW F. McHUGH, New York
JERRY M. PATTERSON, California
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
TED WEISS, New York
BERYL ANTHONY, Jr., Arkansas
BARBARA BOXER, California
SANDER M. LEVIN, Michigan
BRUCE A. MORRISON, Connecticut
J. ROY ROWLAND, Georgia
GERRY SIKORSKI, Minnesota
ALAN WHEAT, Missouri
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California

DAN MARRIOTT, Utah
HAMILTON FISH, Jr., New York
DAN COATS, Indiana
THOMAS J. BLILEY, Jr., Virginia
FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia
DAN BURTON, Indiana
NANCY L. JOHNSON, Connecticut
JOHN R. McKERNAN, Jr., Maine
BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH, Nevada

Committee Staff

Alan J. Stone, *Staff Director and Counsel*
Ann Rosewater, *Deputy Staff Director*
Christine [illegible] Groves, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

Page

Hearing held in Washington, D.C., on April 4, 1984 1

Statement of:

- Bai, Clay, Margaret parent and president of the Virginia Family Day Care Association 55
- Burton, Linda, Mothers-At-Home, Vienna, Va., accompanied by Cheri Loveless, Mothers-At-Home 77
- Githens, James Carver 61
- Henson, Rebecca J., parent, Fairfax County, Va 62
- Hughes, Muriel Poston, parent, Wheaton, Md 74
- Kamerman, Sheila B., Ph. D., professor, Columbia University School of Social Work, and fellow, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, Calif 4
- Rhones, Aaron 55
- Rhones, Carletha 54
- Rhones, Joan, parent, Washington, DC 51
- Tompkins, Rachel, Ed. D., director, Children's Defense Fund, Washington, D.C 28
- Yeamans, Ann, parent, Olney, Md 70
- Zigler, Edward F., Ph. D., sterling professor of psychology and head of the psychology section, Yale Child Study Center; director, Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy, Yale University 24

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, etc.:

- Burton, Linda, Springfield, Va., prepared statement of 81
- Clay, Margaret Bai, president of the Virginia Family Day Care Association, Fairfax County, Va., prepared statement of 60
- Gasper, Jo Ann, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Social Services Policy, Department of Health and Human Services, prepared statement of 98
- Hughes, Muriel Poston, parent, Wheaton, Md., prepared statement of 76
- Kean, Stacey M., Analyst in Government Finance, Economics Division, Congressional Research Service: "Personal and Dependent Exemptions: Distribution of the Exemption for Children by Adjusted Gross Income Class, Tax Year 1981," article entitled 91
- Kamerman, Sheila B., professor, Columbia University School of Social Work, and fellow, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, Calif.:
  - "Child-Care Services: A National Picture," article from Monthly Labor Review, December 1983, vol. 106, No. 12 14
  - "Europe's Innovative Family Policies," article entitled; coauthored by Alfred J. Kahn 105
  - Labor force participation rates (LFPR) of women with children under 18, by marital status of women and age of child, March 1984 (table) 19
  - Prepared statement of 9
  - "The Child-Care Debate: Working Mothers vs. America," article from Working Woman, November 1983 20
- Maltz, Patricia, chief executive officer of Quality Child Care, Inc., prepared statement of 102
- Rhones, Joan, prepared statement of 53
- Tompkins, Rachel, Ed. D., executive director, Children's Defense Fund, prepared statement of 33
- Wiseman, Bonnie, prepared statement of 101
- Yeamans, Ann, parent, Olney, Md.:
  - Letter to Chairman George Miller, dated June 8, 1984, enclosing requested information 91

Page
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, etc.—Continued
Yeamans, Ann, parent, Olney, Md.—Continued
Prepared statement of ... 72
Proposed amendment to the text of the zoning ordinance for the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery County, Md., Zoning Text Amendment No. 82014, adopted August 11, 1982... 85
Zigler, Edward, professor, prepared statement of ... 26

CHILD CARE: BEGINNING A NATIONAL INITIATIVE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4, 1984

House of Representatives,
Select Committee on Children,
Youth, and Families,
Washington, DC.

The select committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:38 a.m., in room 2222, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. George Miller (chairman of the select committee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Miller, Schroeder, Weiss, Rowland, Sikorski, Marriott, Fish, Coats, Bliley, Wolf, Johnson, and McKernan.

Staff present: Alan J. Stone, staff director and counsel; Ann Rosewater, deputy staff director; Jill Kagan, research assistant; Christine Elliott-Groves, minority staff director; Don Kline, senior professional staff; and Joan Godley, committee clerk.

Chairman MILLER. The Committee on Children, Youth, and Families will come to order. This hearing is the first of several designed to raise the level of national debate on child care.

This hearing reflects the committee's desire to move public policy on child care from the 1950's to the 1980's. Today we begin a new national initiative which we hope will produce a set of specific recommendations to the Congress for improving child care services across this Nation.

A few weeks ago we released a study prepared by the Congressional Budget Office. This report concludes that the current mix of child care policies are inadequate, especially in light of the growing number of working mothers, the growing number of single parents, and the growing numbers of young children in America.

The study reflects what our hearings have uncovered across the country—the pace of economic and social changes are outstripping the capacity of our institutions to respond. Could any of us, for example, have predicted that 44.5 percent of all women with children under 1 year of age would be working? Yet, that is one of the facts that we will learn here today.

The simple truth is that the need for affordable child care is now a very real, everyday problem for the majority of American families. Unlike a decade ago, the need today cuts across the entire spectrum of economic and social lines and as a result child care is a less partisan issue than it has been in the past.

The nearly 60 national organizations endorsing our efforts attest to the breadth of constituencies affected—women's groups, religious groups, children's advocacy groups, labor, educators, and youth organizations.

All families are concerned about how to make sure that their children are well supervised, safe, and given the best opportunities for healthy development and learning. This is true of two-parent families. This is true of families with infants, school-age children, large families, and families with a single child.

The care of millions of children is at stake. So are new opportunities for the mothers who want to work or need training if they are to establish self-sufficiency for themselves and their families. Child care as an issue has a common border with just about every major domestic goal, from full employment to economic growth, from improving education to reducing child abuse, from providing early developmental opportunities for the handicapped, and respite for their parents, to helping teenage parents stay in school.

In beginning this new national discussion we are not precluding any possible approaches—whether public or private, Federal, State, or local. The tax code, direct public expenditures, or employer-sponsored benefits, or some combination of these will have to be reviewed, as will volunteer and church-based initiatives.

This is the first in a series of hearings. Future hearings will be scheduled for Texas and California and we will hold a hearing in Connecticut in April on the problems of working families. We will make site visits to various facilities, homes, churches, businesses and schools which are involved in providing child care or which are helping parents learn where to turn to find child care.

We will talk with resource and referral agencies, parents, children, police and fire officials, doctors, researchers, advocates, employers, and anyone else we can find who is concerned with this problem.

I am making today available a fact sheet on child care, as well as a list of nearly 60 national organizations supporting our initiative.

But the first obligation of this committee in the face of this enormous need is to provide a forum for developing recommendations. We will lead off today with the very best researchers in the country, and then, in our tradition, follow with people who are expert in experience—parents and children from nearby communities.

Mr. Marriott.

Mr. **Marriott**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am pleased that our first full committee hearing this year will focus on the problems and the potential solutions for the working family's need for child care. Today we will hear experts in the field who have been involved in the study of these problems for many years. We will also hear from mothers who have taken the initiative to identify working solutions.

The solutions some of these mothers will tell us about include day care for school-age children that involve coordinating the efforts of local school boards, county councils, private day care providers and others.

We will hear from mothers who provide family day care in their homes, a day care option preferred by a great majority of parents who use child care. We will also hear from mothers who have elected to remain at home to care for their children even though they are well qualified in areas where employment is available.

I am also pleased that we will be holding field hearings throughout the country devoted to the subject of child care. As we indicated in the beginning of the year, child care will be one of the major concerns of this committee. We are hopeful that our search for solutions will be productive.

I would like to thank each of the witnesses here today for taking time from their busy schedules to be with us. Some of our witnesses have had a very short time to prepare for this hearing, and I sincerely appreciate the cooperation they have given us under some difficult circumstances. I look forward to learning a great deal from our witnesses today and especially from those who have been successful in solving the problems and who offer options that may be useful to us and to other parents throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you for holding this hearing today and making child care a major priority. I think we are on the brink of establishing some policies in coordination with the private sector and the public sector to help solve some of these problems and make the life of our children a lot better. I look forward to the solutions that come out of these hearings and again I thank you and the other committee members for making this hearing possible.

Chairman **Miller**. Congresswoman Schroeder.

Ms. **Schroeder**. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the child care issue has deep meaning for me. While we can cite statistics on the need, I remember the years when I had two very, very young children here in the Congress. People would ask me what my biggest fear was. I knew I was supposed to say something very serious like would peace be maintained, but my greatest fear was that I would lose day care and my whole life would be totally upset.

My situation was much better than most working parents. I had a good salary level and a spouse who was very understanding. I cannot even imagine the terror that must go through the hearts of many working mothers who do not have that salary cushion and spouse cushion and the other sorts of cushions that I had.

I think that is why there is so much real feeling on this. I am delighted we are moving on the day care initiative. There could not be anything more important.

Chairman **Miller**. Congressman McKernan.

Mr. **McKernan**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to join Congressman Marriott from the minority side here in commending you on conducting these hearings. I think it was H.L. Mencken who once wrote that every complex problem has a simple solution—and it is usually wrong.

Well, we are facing a complex problem, but it is one that is faced by more and more families, both single-parent families as well as two-parent families with both spouses working. I for one look forward to these hearings because I think that probably the child care issue is the most important issue that this committee is going to face during this session of Congress. I commend you, again, on your leadership in really addressing this issue.

I am hoping that we will come up with some creative solutions that are really going to address the needs that clearly are out there for child care in the society. Thank you.

Chairman **Miller**. Congressman Rowland.

Mr. ROWLAND. Mr. Chairman, thank you for having these hearings and I look forward to hearing what the witnesses have to say. I am certain it will be very enlightening for us.

Chairman MILLER. Congressman Johnson.

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, am pleased at the quality of the panels that we have here today and commend you on convening these hearings.

Thank you.

Chairman MILLER. Our first panel will consist of Sheila Kamerman, who is a professor at Columbia University School of Social Work and Fellow, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences in Stanford, CA; Edward Zigler, who is the Sterling Professor of Psychology and head of the psychology section of the Yale Child Study Center and director of the Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy at Yale University; and Rachel Tompkins, who is the executive director of the Children's Defense Fund.

If you will come forward, please. The committee welcomes you and appreciates your taking the time to come share your knowledge and your understanding of this issue with this committee. Your prepared statements will be included in the record in their entirety and feel free to proceed in the manner in which you are most comfortable. We will hear first from you, Dr. Kamerman.

STATEMENT OF SHEILA B. KAMERMAN, PH.D., PROFESSOR, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK, AND FELLOW, CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN THE BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES, STANFORD, CA

Ms. KAMERMAN. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

Chairman MILLER. I think you will have to pull the microphone a little bit closer.

Ms. KAMERMAN. How about that?

Chairman MILLER. Fine.

Research

Ms. KAMERMAN. My name is Sheila Kamerman. In addition to being a professor at Columbia University I also codirect the Cross National Studies Research Program; as part of that program I am currently codirecting a national study of child care services in the United States.

Research

I am delighted to see that the committee is beginning its deliberations by acknowledging that the need for child care services is already well documented. Therefore, given that, what I am going to do is simply highlight some of what I think are the most important new trends and issues that are influencing the need for child care services and the patterns of use at the present time; also mention what some of the options are that are available now.

Demographic facts

So first, a few new and important demographic developments. In 1983, for the first time, slightly more than half of all mothers of preschool age children were in the labor force, including about 58 percent of those who have children aged 3 to 5. That means that 47 percent of preschool aged children now have working mothers. It also suggests two other interesting developments.

First of all, for the first time we are beginning to see the convergence in labor force participation rates of single and married mothers of preschool aged children. Second is the growing continuity of attachment to the labor force by mothers, despite pregnancy and despite maternity; the most dramatic indication of this is the growth in labor force participation rates of women with children less than 1 year of age.

Now close to 45 percent of mothers with children under the age of 1 are in the labor force—an extraordinary increase of almost 30 percent in less than 5 years.

For a quick look at what we know about the effects of out-of-home child care and maternal employment on children and their development, I would point out that although clearly this is an important issue and much discussed and debated, existing research allays some of the fears with regard to what the consequences are.

[illegible]

In particular, the most recent published reviews of research carried out by a National Academy of Science panel that I chaired, suggests that neither of these conditions in and of itself is necessarily harmful to children. However, what we do know, increasingly, is that how children are cared for during the day while their mothers work or while both parents are working is an extremely important aspect of what the consequences may be.

So what do we know about how they are being cared for? Here the picture gets a little bit more cloudy. That is, although we know more than we used to know, we do not have either a precise picture or a complete picture. National data are not collected either systematically or regularly, and in some cases we have no national data at all.

What we do know, however, suggests a rather complex and diverse picture. In particular, if we look at the general trend of what is happening to preschool aged children while mothers work, the trend is toward more use of nonfamilial, out-of-home care. More specifically, first with regard to infant and toddler care, what we know is that there is a scarcity of such care, that it is very expensive, and yet at the same time despite the scarcity and the cost there is growing use of this type of care.

In effect, given the growth in labor force participation rates of women with children under the age of 3—and those rates have grown from 34 percent in 1975 to 46 percent in 1983—given that pattern, the demand for infant and toddler care is inevitably going to increase.

We know about the pattern in use of such care: here we have relatively firm data. Relatives continue to be an important component of the child care used for very young children. However, there is a growing use of out-of-home, nonfamilial care for children of this age, too. More specifically, more than a third of the children under the age of 3 with working mothers are now in out-of-home, nonfamilial care, about two-thirds of them in family day care and the remainder in group care.

For preschoolers, those children aged 3 to 5, what we know increasingly is that the dominant mode of care is some form of group care, largely a preschool program and, to a substantial extent still, part day. The result of this, of course, is that for many children of this age in preschool programs, there is a significant need for supplementary types of child care. One result is a kind of "packaging" of several different types of child care that mothers have to organize, in order to obtain child care for the whole time they are working.

At present we estimate that more than 70 percent of the children aged 3 to 5 that have working mothers are in some form of preschool program. For 5-year-olds this means kindergarten, largely public and largely part day. For 3 and 4-year-olds it means nursery school programs, again largely part day but overwhelmingly private.

Federally subsidized day care and Headstart programs obviously constitute an important component of the services for children of this age, but they are nowhere near adequate at present to meet the needs of those children whose parents qualify for them.

Perhaps one of the most important patterns in the use of preschool programs for children of this age is the growing use by affluent and well-educated parents of some form of either nursery or preschool, as compared with a continued use of more informal care by lower income parents. If we look at 3 and 4-year-olds, about 53 percent of the children in families with incomes above the median level tend to be in preschool programs, while only 29 percent of the children from lower income families are in such programs.

For a quick look at what we know about primary school aged children with working mothers, particularly those aged about 6 to 10, we really know very little. That is, there are no national data on where these children are after school, or when school is closed and no national data on what is available. That is why there are currently estimates of so-called latchkey children that range between 1.8 and 7 million children. The enormous disparity in estimates has to do with who is doing the counting, and what is being counted and how self-care is being defined.

There are a few other trends that are important to note. There has been a significant reduction in the availability of title XX subsidized child care places; in other words, those places that are directly subsidized by public funds and available to low income children.

There is growing evidence that some children are being bounced in and out of subsidized day care centers. Because of the title XX cutbacks, states have reduced the income ceiling for mothers who previously qualified for such care; therefore, as soon as a mother earns a little bit more money, she loses her eligibility for subsidized care in certain States and the children will then be excluded from those programs.

There is growing use of the child care tax credit. That has now become the single largest Federal subsidy for child care. For 1983, the estimates are that it represented about $1.5 billion in tax expenditures. Somewhere between 8 and 9 million children are now having their care partially subsidized through the child care tax credit. What is most dramatic, however, is that it is serving, overwhelmingly, children of middle and upper income families; only a very small number of children from low-income families are able to benefit from that tax credit.

There is growing provision of child care information and referral services. The most interesting developments, of course, are in California, where the State provides a public subsidy for such services. We need to recognize that these services are important in that they increase parents' access to care, but of course the value is limited to the availability of services in each of the communities.

Finally, in terms of the major trends, there is growing discussion, but only modest developments, in what employers are doing in the way of sponsoring child care services. Current estimates range from 415 employers doing something to about 1,000, but there is a great deal of confusion with regard to exactly what it is employers are doing and what is available.

I would note here that about half of what is provided is provided by hospitals. Hospitals, as we know, have a unique problem in meeting the needs of nurses, many of whom are mothers. About another half of what is available is either in the form of modest contributions by employers to community services or in the form of seminars, lectures, meetings, and so forth, available for working employee parents.

A very small number, perhaps 60 programs currently, are operated by employers at the work site, and perhaps an equivalent number of employers are also currently providing some form of financial subsidy, either directly, to pay for child care, or indirectly through the development of something called a salary reduction benefit plan. More employers are beginning to explore establishing such plans, but given recent IRS announcements there is growing concern as to the tax status of such plans for employees.

Probably the most significant development on the part of employer-sponsored child-care services has to do with the growth in information and referral services that employers are sponsoring. A growing number of the very large and leading employers are exploring these services. This is where I think future developments will occur.

Now for some issues, and here there are four issues that I would like to highlight. First and most important, the supply of infant and toddler care, full-day preschool programs and after-school programs, is still overwhelmingly inadequate. Although many mothers, in particular low-income single mothers, have no choice with regard to work and therefore use whatever child care service they can find, a recent census report found that more than one-third of mothers with incomes under $15,000 a year who were not now in the labor force would in fact go out and look for work, and would hope to find work if they could first obtain affordable, decent child care.

In general, infant and toddler care has long waiting lists, wherever such programs exist. The family day care providers increasingly tell us, as we carry out interviews, that they really do not want to care for infants. In addition, many communities still have absolutely nothing available in the way of after-school programs.

2 The second issue is the continuing and growing problem of access to child care services. In effect, with the growth in supply there has been also a recent growth in diversity. Parents find themselves in a situation in which they do not know where to look for children and, more important, they do not quite understand how to assess differential quality of care and how to be sure they get something that is good.

Related to the above is the growing concern about the quality of child care services provided. Given the absence of uniform child care standards around the country, the decrease in State supervisory activities, and the decline in standards at the State level—all the results of both cutbacks in title XX as well as the elimination of Federal requirements—given all of this, we are seeing around the country a growing decline in the quality of care available.

The fourth issue is the continued problem of affordability, in particular for low-income families. Given the cutbacks in supply subsidies such as title XX and the parallel growth in consumer or demand subsidies such as the child care tax credit, we now have a situation in which public subsidies are increasingly available to middle class and affluent families and subsidized care is less available to low-income families.

The tax credit, although clearly important, has very limited value at present for low-income families. In particular, it is quite clear that where such families are concerned, for example, a family with income under $10,000 a year parents are not going to be able to spend $2,400 a year on child care for one child, let alone $4,800 for two.

I would add here that although we have not carried out any systematic study of the costs of child care around the country—and I do not know of anybody else who has recently—what we are hearing from those provides with whom we have discussed costs and fees is that in low cost areas the average or typical fee is about $45 a week for preschool-aged children, and $55 a week for infant care.

We are also being told, increasingly, that the difference in infant and toddler care costs between family day care and group care programs is negligible. In higher cost communities the prevailing fees are about $75 a week and higher for preschool-aged children and $125 a week and higher for infant care.

In general, it seems quite obvious that given the low wages of many women and the growing numbers of female heads of families who are likely to have low incomes generally, the problem of the cost of care and the fees charged parents is especially serious.

Now for some recommendations, and I give these recognizing that the committee is at the beginning of its deliberations and that quite obviously it is going to make its recommendations at the end. I might also add that since our own child care study is still in process we are not prepared to make any comprehensive recommendations either and will not be until sometime next fall.

However, given where we are in our study, there are certain issues that have emerged and certain recommendations that we feel we can make at this time. I urge the committee to give them serious consideration.

First, the rapid growth in labor force participation rates of women with children under the age of one is going to place an increasing demand on already insufficient infant care places. Moreover, what is going on, given this trend, underscores the inadequacy of maternity and parenting policies in the United States at the present time. I would urge that any policy consideration given to infant care pay attention to the importance of maternity and parenting-related leaves from work, both unpaid and paid leaves.

A second recommendation: We know increasingly that affluent and well-educated parents use preschools as their preferred mode of child care for children ages 3 through 5. These parents do so regardless of whether the mothers are in the labor force. They do so because they think this is a very valuable experience for young children.

I would urge that the committee be extremely sensitive to the potential for developing a two-tier system of child care, one in which children from low-income families are closed out of an experience that is increasingly being identified as important for the development of these children.

Here, therefore, what I would recommend is that consideration be given to providing incentives to State and local governments to expand public prekindergartens and to extend part-day kindergartens to a full day. Such an approach would certainly contribute to the avoidance of any development of a two-tier system.

A third recommendation. As we all know, there is a substantial gap between the school day and the school year on the one hand and the work day and the work year on the other. Most working mothers work full time and the proportion who do so is rising. The issue of after-school care is appropriately in the province of State and local governments, but clearly there is need for Federal help and perhaps incentives here, too. I would urge this as a high priority and a relatively low cost item.

A fourth recommendation. Given the disparities in the quality of child care available and given the decline in State standards and supervisory activities, strong consideration should be given to the use of Federal leverage to raise and enforce standards.

And finally my fifth recommendation. Given the continued problem of affordability I would urge the expansion of the dependent tax care credit, including making it refundable for low income working parents and at the same time increasing title XX budget funds so that it will no longer be necessary for programs to bounce children in and out of care as soon as their mothers manage to earn a little more money.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

[Prepared statement of Sheila B. Kamerman follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SHEILA B. KAMERMAN, PROFESSOR, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK, AND FELLOW, CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN THE BEHAVORIAL SCIENCES, STANFORD, CA

This Committee had correctly noted that the need for child care services is clear and well-documented.[1] There is widespread recognition that most women with children under 18 are in the labor force (59 percent in 1983), that most children have working mothers (54 percent), and that most mothers who work, do so full time (more than 70 percent of those with school-aged children and 62 percent of those with preschoolers).

In my testimony today, I will provide some information on five aspects of child care services:[2]

Some less well-known demographic data that have implications for the future of child care services.

A reminder concerning research findings on the effects on children of maternal employment and non-familial, out-of-home child care.

An overview of what is known about where the children of working mothers are cared for.

---

[1] The information presented in this testimony is from a national study of child care services, sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation, based at the Columbia University School of Social Work, and co-directed by Sheila B. Kamerman and Alfred J. Kahn.

[2] For some additional detail see the two articles appended, one published in the *Monthly Labor Review* and the second in *Working Woman*.

A summary of current trends in child care.

A brief list of issues.

1. Some new demographic data that are particularly salient to any discussion of child care today:[3]

In 1983, for the first time, slightly more than half of all mothers of children under age 6 were in the labor force, including 58 percent of the mothers of children aged 3 to 5 and 46 percent of the mothers of children under age 3. Forty-seven percent of children under age 6, including 49 percent of those aged 3 to 5 and 45 percent of those under 3 had working mothers last year. Although single mothers have always had higher labor force participation rates than married motherss, one important new development is that among women with preschool aged children, labor force participation rates for single and married mothers are converging. A second new and dramatic development is the growing continuity of women's labor force attachment despite pregnancy and childbirth. For example, labor force participation rates for women with children under one year of age (and wives and single mothers have almost the same rates) was 44.5 percent in 1983, an increase of almost 30 percent since 1979, when the rate was 34 percent.

2. The effects on children:

Although the consequences of maternal employment for child development, and the consequences of non-familial, out-of-home care arrangements for child development have been—and still are—much discussed and debated, existing research should allay at least some fears. Recent reviews of research have concluded that neither maternal employment nor out-of-home child care, is a condition that in and of itself, is harmful to children.[4] What is important, however, especially for very young children, is *how* they are cared for during the day, while both parents or their sole parent is at work.

THE CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS OF CHILDREN OF WORKING MOTHERS

In presenting this brief overview of where children are cared for, the types of care described include: family day care (care in the home of a non-relative) and center care; public and private nursery schools, preschools, prekindergartens, and Head Start programs; all day, part day and after school care, provided on a regular basis. (Relative care is referred to, but counted separately from non-relative care.)

Unfortunately, although we know far more than previously, we still do not have either a precise or a complete picture of how preschool and primary school children are cared for while their mothers work. Moreover, what we do know suggests a diverse and complicated picture. National data are not collected regularly nor in any systematic fashion, so that to describe who uses what types of care we must piece together different, sometimes not fully comparable data, collected by different sources at different times. Furthermore, there are groups of children and/or types of care for which there are no data.

Infant and toddler care—care for children under 3—continues to be relatively scarce and expensive, yet is one of the most rapidly growing types of child care. Given the recent but rapid growth in labor force participation rates for women with children of this age (from 34 percent in 1975 to 46 percent in 1983), and given the inadequacy of maternity or parent leaves following childbirth, the need for this type of care is likely to grow still larger.

According to a Census Bureau report of child care arrangements used by working mothers in 1982, relative care continues to be very important for this age group, but use of family day care and group care is growing.[5] More than one third of these very young children (including 40 percent of those whose mothers work full time) are cared for outside their home, by non-relatives—about 25 percent in family day care and 10 percent in groups programs. Child care "packages"—the regular use of more than one type of care—are used by 16 percent of the mothers, and even more, by about 28 percent, when fathers are an important component of the child care "package".

For preschoolers, aged 3 to 5, we have only piecemeal data. There are no national data on how the whole cohort is cared for, nor are there recent data on child care programs, nor on what local schools are providing. Using a combination of 1982 school enrollment data and 1977 day care enrollment data, we conclude that the primary type of care for this age group is some form of group care, usually in a preschool program, often one that is only part day and thus may require supplementary care arrangements. The major new developments are the beginning growth in full day preschool programs and in public school based programs.

---

[3] The statistics cited here are from both published and unpublished data provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

[4] See, for example, Sheila B. Kamerman and Cheryl D. Hayes, eds., *Families That Work*, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1982 and Cheryl D. Hayes and Sheila B. Kamerman, *Children of Working Parents*, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1983.

[5] U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 129, *Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers: June 1982*, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1983.

We estimate that more than 70 percent of the children of this age, with working mothers, are in a group program for at least a part of the day. For the 5 year olds, this usually means kindergarten, usually public, and usually part day. For 3 and 4 year olds, it may mean a nursery school or pre-kindergarten program, also part day, but in this case overwhelmingly private. Enrollment in nursery schools doubled since 1970 and the proportion of the age group attending these programs has grown even more. For these children, multiple forms of care are especially likely since so many programs are part day. Federally subsidized day care centers and Head Start programs are also an important component of the service system for these children but space is inadequate even to meet the needs of those who qualify.

Of particular importance, the preschool programs are being used increasingly, whether or not mothers work, by parents who see them as an important developmental experience for their children. Indeed, a major concern is the possible emergence of a dual system of child care in which children of affluent and well-educated parents attend preschool programs—whether or not their mothers work—and children of low income families use more informal care. As illustration: 53 percent of 3-4 year olds in families with median or higher incomes attended preschool programs in 1982 as contrasted with 29 percent of those in families with lower incomes. Similarly, 72 percent of 4 year olds whose mothers are college graduates were in a preschool program.

We have no national data on where primary school children (aged 6-10, in particular) are cared for when school is closed or when their mothers work day goes beyond the school day. We know that the demand for before and after school care is growing and that the supply is growing, too—but is nowhere near able to meet the demand. But we have no systematic data on how these children are cared for, by whom and where. The estimates for so-called latch-key children range from 1.8 million to 7 million depending on which children are counted and what is defined as "self-care".

TRENDS

Among the most significant trends we have identified are the following:

More out of home, non-familial care is being used for preschoolers generally, including infants and toddlers, and group care, especially, is expanding. The demand continues to grow, in particular, for infant and toddler care, school aged child care, and for full-day preschool programs.

More 3 to 5 year olds are attending preschool programs whether or not their mothers are working, and there seems to be a growing divergence in patterns of care for this age group, by family income and parents' education.

There is continued growth in church-sponsored child care services and in for-profit child care; and there are some signs of growth in public school-based programs.

There has been a significant reduction in the numbers of child care places that are subsidized directly by public funds, largely as a consequence of the cutbacks in Title XX funds.

There is some evidence that children are being "bounced" in and out of income-tested, publicly subsidized child care programs, in some states, as the income criteria for eligibility are reduced as a consequence of less Title XX funds, and as low income working women alternately gain and lose their eligibility for subsidized care, with minor changes in labor force status or earnings.

There is growing use of the child care tax credit, now the largest single federal child care subsidy benefitting between 8 and 9 million children and costing about $1.5 billion in tax expenditures in 1983. However, according to the Congressional Budget Office, only about 7 percent of the 4.6 million families using the credit had incomes below $10,000 in 1981 and less than 6 percent of the tax credits went to these families.

There is growing provision of child care information and referral (I&R) services. The most extensive development is in California, a state that provides a public subsidy for these services. Child care I&R services constitute an important device for facilitating access to child care—by helping parents learn about what is available—

and for providing parent-consumer education regarding how to choose a satisfactory child care service.

There is growing discussion—but very modest development—of employer sponsored child care. Although the estimates range from 415 to about 1,000 employers, there are no firm numbers regarding which employers are doing what. And there is a good deal of confusion regarding what is being provided. A very large part of what is included are hospital-based or related child care services. Another large group are employers making modest contributions to community facilities, or sponsoring occasional workshops and seminars for employee-parents. In contrast, there are estimated to be only about 60 child care centers actually at the workplace in private places of employment. Given the current attitudes of both employee-parents and employers, it does not seem likely that these programs will experience a very large growth. There are about the same number of employers who are subsidizing some part of employees' child care costs or facilitating payment with tax free dollars through a salary reduction or flexible benefit plan. More are exploring this but a recent IRS announcement may have raised questions for some employers about the tax status of such an approach. The most likely form that employer sponsorship will take is provision of information and referrral services. Several companies are now providing—or planning to provide—such services. This is currently a very worthwhile endeavor but clearly is not the solution to existing child care needs.

ISSUES: CURRENT AND EMERGING

The supply of infant and toddler care, full day preschool, and after school programs is still inadequate. Although many mothers, especially single mothers, have no choice but to work and use whatever type of child care they can find, a recent Census report indicates that 36 percent of women with children under age 5, in families with incomes under $15,000, would look for work if child care were available at reasonable cost, in constrast to 13 percent in families with incomes over $25,000.[6] Infant and toddler care centers often have waiting lists and after school programs are almost non-existent in many communities.

There is a growing problem of access to child care services because the increased diversity of programs has led to a situation in which parents do not know where to find child care nor how to identify which services are "good".

Related to the above, there is growing concern about the quality of child care provided as well as about the problems parents have in ascertaining quality, given the absence of uniform child care service standards, the decrease in state supervisory activities, and a decline in standards at the state level—all as a consequence of Title XX cutbacks and the elimination of federal requirements.

There is a continued problem of affordability, in particular for low income families, as supply subsidies such as Title XX have been reduced and the demand or consumer subsidies such as the dependent care tax credit have limited or no value for such families. Moreover, the tax credit does not really compensate for a significant portion of child care costs for these families, since it is highly unlikely that a family with an income of $10,000, for example, would spend $2400 for child care for one child, let alone $4800 for two! We have not carried out a systematic study of child care fees nationally, nor do we know of anyone who has done so recently, but in those states where we visited programs in 1983, (California, Florida, Massachusetts, New York, Texas) child care fees of $45 a week for preschool and $55 for infant care were at the "low" end, and fees differed very little between group care and family day care. In more expensive areas, the weekly fees were $75 and $125 respectively, and higher.

Given the low wages of many women, the growing numbers of female-headed families, and the likelihood that they have very low incomes, the problem of the cost of care—and the fees charged parents—is especially serious.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I realize that the Committee is only at the beginning of its explorations, and will make its recommendations much later. Our own child care study is still in process and not prepared with comprehensive recommendations yet. However, it is already clear that the following deserve Committee consideration:

1. The rapid growth in labor force participation rates of women with children less than one year of age, places enormous pressure on an insufficient supply of infant care and underscores the inadequacy of maternity-related policies in the U.S. Any

---

[6] U.S. Bureau of the Census, op. cit.

policy concerning infant care should include attention to maternity and parenting policies that make possible paid and job-protected leaves for some time after childbirth.

2. Affluent and well-educated parents use preschools, increasingly, as their preferred child care service for children aged 3–5. We need to be very sensitive to the potential for developing a two-tier system, in which children from low income families are closed out of such an experience. Providing incentives for state and local governments to expand public pre-kindergartens and extend kindergartens to a full day would help avoid this development.

3. There is a substantial gap between the school day and year and the work day and year. Most working mothers work full time. The issue of after school care is properly in the province of state and local government, but there is need for federal help and perhaps incentives here, too. This is a high priority item that need not be very expensive.

4. Given the wide disparities in the quality of child care available, and the decline in state standards and supervisory activities, strong consideration should be given to the use of Federal leverage to raise and enforce standards.

5. Given the continued problem of affordability, we would urge: (a) the expansion of the dependent care tax credit, including making it refundable for low income working parents; and (b) increasing Title XX budget funds so that it will no longer be necessary for states to "bounce" children from child care centers as soon as their mothers earn a little more.

[From Monthly Labor Review, December 1983, Vol. 106, No. 12]

Child-care services: a national picture

As more mothers hold jobs, the demand for child-care services continues to grow—especially for infant and toddler care—and is exacerbated by brief maternity leaves

Sheila B. Kamerman

In 1983, for the first time, half of all mothers with children under age 6 were in the labor force.[1] Out of a cohort of 19.0 million children under age 6, 47 percent had working mothers. In the near future, the *majority* of preschoolers will very likely have working mothers, as most school-age children already do. How preschool children are cared for while their mothers work is something that relatively little is known about, although what is known suggests a quite complicated picture.

What is the picture today of child-care services for preschool aged children? To help the reader visualize the picture, four questions are addressed:

- Where are the children of working parents being cared for?
- What is known about the kinds of child-care services and arrangements that now exist?
- What is known about the quality of care now provided and what is happening to it?
- What are the current trends, developments, and emerging issues in the child-care services field?

For the purposes of this article, child-care services will include: family day care and center care, public and private nursery school and prekindergartens, Head Start centers, all-day care, part-day care, and after-school care. (Nonmonetized care by relatives and brief, occasional babysitting are not included.) The discussion is about relatively regular care or attendance: a specific number of hours per day and regular days per week of provision—in families and group arrangements—under both educational and social welfare auspices.

Types and amount of available child care

Unfortunately, in addition to the child-care picture not being very clear, it is not very complete. National data are not collected in any systematic fashion on: children in out-of-home care during the day; child-care arrangements used while parents work; or child-care service programs. To study what exists and who uses which type of care, one must piece together different, sometimes not fully comparable data, collected by different sources at different times.

In providing an overview of child-care services for preschool aged children, the types of services can be distinguished by the following:

- The age of the child:
  - —infant and toddler care (0 to 2-year-olds)
  - —preschooler care (3- to 5-year-olds)
- The locus of care:
  - —in own home
  - —in a relative's home
  - —in a nonrelative's home
  - —in a group facility (center or school)

Sheila B. Kamerman is a professor of Social Policy and Planning and co-director of Cross-National Studies Research Program, Columbia University and currently is a fellow at the Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- The auspice of care
    - —education (nursery school, prekindergarten, kindergarten)
    - —social welfare (day-care center)
- The source of funds
    - —direct and indirect public subsidy (for example, public grants of monies to a provider or a tax benefit such as the child-care tax credit)
    - —private subsidy
    - —employer subsidy, parent fees

Preschoolers. Although there are no precise figures concerning the numbers of children in out-of-home care, by age of child and type of care, the most complete data to date are those on preschool children aged 3 to 5. However, even here estimates must be used.

The most recent national survey of day-care centers was completed by Abt Associates in 1977;[2] the numbers are known to have grown substantially since then. Moreover, these data do not include programs under educational auspices: nursery schools, prekindergartens, and kindergartens. These are the largest single type of child-care services for children of this age and the most rapidly growing component among child-care services for this age group.

The most currently published consumer data on 3- and 4-year-old children of working mothers are from a 1977 Current Population Survey (CPS) conducted by the Bureau of the Census.[3] Only data on children *under age 5* and on the *youngest* child in the family were included. However, because the survey was carried out in June, when many schools are closed, children in group care programs are significantly underreported. For example, fewer than 21 percent of children of this age with mothers who worked full time in 1977 were reported as enrolled in group care, as contrasted with 31 percent of *all* children this age in 1976, according to Census Bureau school enrollment data,[4] and 37 percent in 1980, as cited by the National Center for Educational Statistics.[5] (See tables 1 and 2.) Furthermore, the proportion of youngsters enrolled in preschool programs was significantly higher when their mothers worked (44 percent). Moreover, these data do not report multiple modes of care: the "packages" of child-care arrangements which are most frequently used by working mothers.[6] Such "packages" include some combination of a preschool program, family day care, and relative care; they may involve four or more different care givers during an average week. More extensive child-care data were collected in the 1982 Census Bureau's national fertility survey, but these data had not yet been published when this article was prepared.

Table 1. Population of preschoolers, preprimary school enrollment, and labor force status of mother by child's age, 1980

Child's age (in years)	Total (in millions)	Enrollment		Percent with mothers in labor force
		Number (in millions)	Percent of total	
3 to 5	9.3	4.9[1]	53[1]	57
5	3.1	2.6	84[2]	55
3 to 4	6.2	2.3	37	43
4	3.1	1.4	46	52
3	3.1	.9	29	34

[1] Preprimary programs only. An additional number are enrolled in primary school (about 3 percent of cohort).

[2] An additional 9 percent are enrolled in primary school.

NOTE: Data are for 50 States and District of Columbia.

SOURCE: National Center for Education Statistics, *Preprimary Enrollment 1980* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1982).

Using 1979 school enrollment data[7] and data from the 1977 Abt supply study of day-care enrollment, it is found that almost two-thirds of *all* 3- to 5-year-olds and more than 70 percent of those with working mothers are in some form of group child-care program. These numbers are made up of the following: ninety-three percent of all 5-year-olds were in nursery school, kindergarten, or first grade in 1979. Thirty-five percent of all 3- to 4-year-olds were in nursery school or prekindergarten. A growing number of these preschool programs are full day; the proportion of 3- to 5-year-olds in a full-day program doubled during the 1970's, from 17 percent in 1970, to 34 percent in 1980. By 1980, 37 percent of 3- to 4-year-olds were in preprimary programs. Although kindergarten enrollment for 5-year-olds is about the same whether or not mothers work (almost all 5-year-olds are in preschool or primary school), enrollment rates for 3- to 4-year-olds are significantly higher when mothers are in the labor force (44 percent, compared with 31 percent in 1980). All-day enrollment is, of course, far higher for children with full-time working mothers. Although these programs may be valued for their educational content, they are often used because they fulfill a needed child-care function.

Kindergarten enrollment increased by almost one-third between 1967 and 1980 (from 65 to 85 percent). However, the increase in nursery school enrollment has been even more dramatic, doubling in numbers during the 1970's and more than doubling as a proportion of 3- to-4-year-olds enrolled (from 16 percent in 1969 to 37 percent in 1980).

Moreover, not only are children of working mothers more likely to be enrolled in preschool programs, but the enrollment rates are even higher when mothers have larger incomes and more education. Fifty-three percent of 3- to 4-year-old children in families with median or higher incomes attended a preschool program in 1982, as contrasted with only 29 percent of those in lower income families. As noted, enrollment rates increase as mothers' education levels rise, and increase still more when those mothers are employed. Only for children whose mothers are college graduates is there no difference between those with working and those with nonworking mothers. For example, about half of such 3-year-olds and 72 percent of such 4-year-olds were in a preschool program in 1982.[8]

Given these data, one could argue that not only is there growing use of preschool as a child-care service for the 3-, 4-, and 5-year-olds with working mothers, but there is especially high use by affluent, educated, working families.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2 Preprimary school enrollment by child's age and labor force status of mother, 1980

(Numbers in thousands)

Labor force status of mother	Total		3-year-olds		4-year-olds		5-year-olds	
	Enrolled	Enrolled all day	Enrolled	Enrolled all day	Enrolled	Enrolled all day	Enrolled	Enrolled all day
All children, 3 to 5 years	4 878	1 551	857	321	1 423	467	2 598	783
With mother in labor force	2 480	1 002	497	260	755	332	1 229	413
Employed full time	1 445	713	292	198	457	260	696	255
Employed part time	811	196	163	42	245	44	402	111
Unemployed	225	94	41	20	53	28	131	46
With mother not in labor force	2 266	491	339	50	628	117	1 299	325
Keeping house	2 105	430	309	37	582	102	1 214	300
Other	85	15	15	3	23	3	47	9
No mother present	131	57	21	13	39	19	70	26
	Enrolled as percent of age group							
All children, 3 to 5 years	52 5	16 7	27 3	10 2	46 3	15 2	84 7	24 9
With mother in labor force	57 1	23 1	34 4	18 0	51 9	22 8	85 2	28 6
Employed full time	57 4	23 3	35 4	24 0	52 5	29 9	84 6	31 0
Employed part time	58 6	14 4	37 2	9 6	53 7	9 6	86 5	23 9
Unemployed	48 5	20 3	22 8	11 1	41 1	21 7	85 1	29 9
With mother not in labor force	48 9	10 6	21 8	3 2	41 5	7 7	84 5	21 1
Keeping house	48 5	10 1	20 8	2 5	40 2	7 2	83 9	20 7
In school	63 0	29 5	37 2	(1)	56 1	(1)	95 1	(1)
Other	51 1	9 0	26 4	(1)	38 3	(1)	95 9	(1)
No mother present	42 2	12 5	17 8	10 8	38 6	18 8	77 8	28 9

[1] Base too small for presentation of percentage

NOTE Data are for 50 States and District of Columbia. Details may not add to totals because of rounding

SOURCE National Center for Education Statistics, *Preprimary Enrollment 1980* (Washington, D C U S Department of Education, 1982

Because most of these programs are private and relatively expensive, such high use by the more affluent raises serious questions about the consequences for those children in lower income families (below median income) without access to such programs, whether or not their mothers work.

According to the Abt survey, in addition to those children in preschool programs, about 10 percent of the cohort (900,000) were in day-care centers (most were 3- or 4-year-olds). Thus, there seems to be a total of 54 percent of the 3- and 4-year-olds with working mothers in some kind of group care for some part of the day. This figure is likely to be higher because nearly a half million children are estimated to have been enrolled in Title XX funded centers in 1981, a significant increase over the 1977 figures.[9] (And 10 States were not included in the 1981 figure because they did not provide data.) Sixty-five percent of these children were 3- to 5-year-olds (and more than half were age 3 or 4), and almost all had working parents (these figures may have decreased in the past year). Also, Head Start serves nearly 400,000 children, largely 3- and 4-year-olds.

Federally funded (Title XX) centers have increased in numbers, too: there were an estimated 11,342 in 1981, a significant jump from the 8,100 identified in the Abt survey.[10] Some of these centers may have closed in the past year as a consequence of cutbacks in funding, but no specific data on closings are available as of this writing. Head Start programs have also expanded since 1977 and about one-fifth are full-day programs. More than 40 percent of the day-care centers in the Abt survey were proprietary or for-profit establishments. Both the numbers and the proportion of proprietary child-care services have grown significantly since then. Because most of the large (multicenter) for-profit child-care service companies did not receive Title XX money in 1981, these numbers are additive rather than overlapping.

In addition, about 42 percent of 3- to 4-year-olds whose mothers worked full time in 1977 (and 25 percent of those whose mothers worked part time) were cared for in someone else's home, usually in a nonrelative's home (family day care).[11] There is a significant, if unknown, overlap between the children in preschool programs and those cared for in a home, be it by a relative or nonrelative, part of the child-care "packaging" mentioned above, and particularly important for children whose mothers work longer than the preschool or school hours. About 100,000 children were in federally funded family day-care homes in 1981.[12] By far, most children in family day care (about 90 percent of the more than 6 million children estimated to be in family day care for 10 hours or more per week in 1975) were in informal, unregulated care.[13] About 6 percent were in licensed care, including 2 percent in care provided in a home but under the sponsorship of an umbrella agency. However, most of these children were under age 3.

Infants and toddlers. As difficult as it is to estimate coverage and type of care provided for preschoolers, the data on infant and toddler care are far less adequate. A planned national survey of infant care, to be carried out by Abt, was cancelled. The much-cited National Consumer Day Care Study was poorly designed and inadequately analyzed. According to the 1977 Current Population Survey, the primary care arrangement for children under age 3 was family day care, usually in the home of a nonrelative.

Estimating from the CPS data, more than one-third of the children with working mothers were in either family day

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

care or group care in 1977. More specifically, about one-third of those under age 3 with full-time working mothers and 17 percent of those with part-time working mothers were in family day care, and more than 9 percent of those with full-time working mothers and 5.5 percent of those whose mothers worked part time were in group care. Infant and toddler care has been growing rapidly since the mid-1970's; thus, the coverage data are undoubtedly higher today.

The following rounds out this picture of how children are cared for while parents (especially mothers) are in the labor force:

- A small proportion of babies with working mothers are cared for, albeit briefly, by mothers on maternity leave. Fewer than 40 percent of working mothers are entitled to some paid leave at the time of childbirth, usually for about 6 to 8 weeks, and a somewhat larger group may remain home on an unpaid but job-protected leave for 3 or 4 months.[14]
- Some parents, especially those with preschool aged children, work different shifts in order to manage child care. Although this method of care has received very little attention thus far, researchers using three different data sets (the Current Population Survey, the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, and the Quality of Employment Survey) have found that this may be a more significant pattern of work by parents with young children than suspected.[15]
- A very few employers, largely hospitals, provide onsite child-care services (about 230 hospitals, about 50 employers), and a few others subsidize payment of care.[16]

Child-care quality: programming and standards

More than half of all nursery schools are private, 66 percent. Eighty-eight percent of the kindergartens are public. There are limited national data available on these programs. On the other hand, a much more extensive picture exists regarding the more than 11,000 federally funded day-care centers that existed in the fall of 1981. This type of center is discussed here.

In early 1980, the Department of Health and Human Services issued proposed day-care regulations concerning group size, staff-to-child ratios, training qualifications for care givers, nutrition, health care, parent participation, and social services, to become effective in October. In the meantime, the Congress, in its Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1980, delayed the effective date of these proposed regulations. Before the proposals could become effective, the Social Services Block Grant Act was enacted. Among other things, this Act amended Federal requirements and standards regarding Title XX day-care centers. This meant that State and local standards, where they existed, were in effect. (Such standards are likely to be below those set by the Federal Government.)

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act mandated the Department of Health and Human Services to "assist each State in conducting a systematic assessment of current practices in Title XX funded day-care programs and provide a summary report of the assessment to Congress by June 1, 1981."[17] According to the report, provider practices were in compliance with or surpassed the proposed Federal standards. More specifically:

- Despite the fact that 24 of the 47 States reporting have no group size requirements, all stated their centers had groups smaller than those set in the proposed regulations for all but the under-2-year-olds.
- Staff-to-child ratios were significantly higher than proposed for children aged 3 and older; however, they were significantly lower for those under 3.
- Although only half the States required the centers to provide training, nearly all provided such training and three-quarters of centers' care givers and one-half of family day-care mothers had gone through such a training program within the past year.
- Seventy-five percent of the centers (and half of the homes) provided the Department of Agriculture's recommended child-care food program.
- Seventy percent of the States assured children in care funded by Title XX the needed health services and 75 percent assured them needed social services.

Federal funding under Title XX has been significantly cut since 1981. Day care was one of the three highest funded Title XX services, representing 18 percent of all Title XX expenditures nationwide. Funding for the child nutrition program, a component of public support of day care, has also been reduced. Few programs have actually closed thus far, but this may occur in the future. Given the large cutbacks in Federal grants to States, most States are under growing financial pressure in this area. These States will view themselves as fortunate if they can maintain the quantity of care; they are unlikely to enforce standards, even if standards exist.

A question emerges regarding whether the extent of compliance that existed in 1981 was not related to the expectations of Federal standards and enforcement. From now on, the States will have primary responsibility for setting and enforcing standards concerning the health, safety, and developmental needs of children in care. Whether providers will continue to maintain these standards and whether States will monitor what providers do remains to be seen. Thus, day-care regulation joins preprimary school generally as an arena in which the protection of children will depend completely on the State.

Towards the future

The only significant Federal development is the expansion of the child-care tax credit in 1982 and, subsequently, making it available even to those who do not itemize deductions. However, unless the credit is increased, and made refundable, it will have no—or very little—value to low- and moderate-income families.

The Dependent Care Assistance plan and the salary reduction plan for certain private insurance benefits may open the way for some expansion in employer-sponsored child-care services.[18] However, little has occurred as yet.

The major development in the field in recent years has been child-care information and referral services. These have burgeoned, especially in California, where they are publicly funded; this is an area in which more employers are considering involvement as well. Finally, concern with the quality of education is leading some States and localities to reexamine their preprimary programs. Some are now initiating full-day kindergartens, others are establishing prekindergarten programs; and still others are considering both.

The demand for child-care services continues to grow, and most parents of preschoolers want an educational program. Most such programs are private, particularly those below kindergarten level. Unfortunately, good programs are very often expensive. Moreover, there is still a scarcity of full-day programs, so many parents are "packaging" a group program with one or more other types of care, with consequences not yet known. The cutbacks in funding group programs are especially significant in their impact on services for low- and middle-income children. Many of these children who were in publicly subsidized preschool programs are being transferred into informal and unregulated family day care as subsidies are cut back and programs close or parents lose their eligibility for a subsidy; the children must adapt to a new care giver, and often to the loss of friends.

The biggest current demand for child-care services is for infants and toddlers, because it is among their mothers that the increase in labor force participation has been greatest, and the scarcity of services most severe. Paid maternity (disability) leaves are available only to a minority of working women and are usually brief. There is an urgent need to expand and improve maternity-related benefits provided at the workplace.[19] Data concerning how babies and toddlers are being cared for and what types of care exist are largely inadequate. Most of these children are in informal family day-care arrangements but, here again, little is known about these services.

Although the current child-care picture is hardly complete, all that is known suggests the likelihood of continuing demand. Accessibility, affordability, and quantity will remain central issues but questions regarding *quality* will increasingly come to the forefront. ☐

——*FOOTNOTES*——

ACKNOWLEDGMENT: This article is based on work done as a part of a national study of child-care services sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation.

[1] Elizabeth Waldman, "Labor force statistics from a family perspective," *Monthly Labor Review*, December 1983, pp. 14–18.

[2] U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, in collaboration with Abt Associates, Inc. (Cambridge, Mass.), *National Day Care Study* (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979), and *National Day Care Home Study* (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980).

[3] *Trends in Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers*, *Current Population Reports*, Series P–23, No. 117 (Bureau of the Census, 1982).

[4] *Nursery School and Kindergarten Enrollment of Children and Labor Force Status of Their Mothers, October 1967 to October 1976*, *Current Population Reports*, Series P–20, No. 318 (Bureau of the Census, 1978).

[5] *Preprimary Enrollment 1980* (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, 1982).

[6] Mary Jo Bane, Laura Lein, Lydia O'Donnell, C. Ann Stueve, and Barbara Wells, "Child care arrangements of working parents," *Monthly Labor Review*, October 1979, pp. 50–56; and Sheila B. Kamerman, *Parenting In An Unresponsive Society: Managing Work and Family Life* (New York, The Free Press, 1980).

[7] *School Enrollment—Social and Economic Characteristics of Students: October 1979*, *Current Population Reports*, Series P–20, No. 360 (Bureau of the Census, 1981); and *National Day Care Study*.

[8] National Center for Education Statistics, unpublished data.

[9] *Report to Congress: Summary Report of the Assessment of Current State Practices in Title XX Funded Day Care Programs* (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, 1982).

[10] Ibid.

[11] *Trends in Child Care Arrangements.*

[12] *Report to Congress.*

[13] UNCO, Inc., *National Child Care Consumer Study: 1975* (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1977).

[14] Sheila B. Kamerman, Alfred F. Kahn, and Paul W. Kingston, *Maternity Policies and Working Women* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1983).

[15] Steven L. Nock and Paul W. Kingston, "The Family Workday," *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, forthcoming; Harriet B. Presser, "Working Women and Child Care," in P. W. Berman and E. R. Ramey, eds., *Women: A Developmental Perspective* (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982); and Graham L. Staines and Joseph H. Pleck, "Work Schedules' Impact on the Family," Research Monograph, 1982, processed.

[16] Sandra L. Burud, Raymond C. Collins, Patricia Divine-Hawkins, "Employer-Supported Child Care: Everybody Benefits," *Children Today*, May–June 1983, pp. 2–7.

[17] See *Report to Congress*. The data provided in this report are baseline data for future assessments of the quality of Title XX funded day care once these programs are no longer subject to Federal regulation.

[18] For a description of these benefits, see Sheila B. Kamerman, *Meeting Family Needs: the Corporate Response* (White Plains, N.Y., Work in America, forthcoming).

[19] Kamerman, Kahn, and Kingston, *Maternity Policies*.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION RATES (LFPR) OF WOMEN WITH CHILDREN UNDER 18, BY MARITAL STATUS OF WOMEN AND AGE OF CHILD (March 1984)

		LFPR	
Age of Children	All Mothers	Married	Single
Under 18	61	59	66
6- 17	68	65	77
Under 6	52	52	53
3 - 5	59	58	63
Under 3	48	48	45
Under 12 months	46	—	—

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Unpublished data.

THE CHILD-CARE DEBATE: WORKING MOTHERS VS. AMERICA

Should mothers work? Americans still ask, including the jobholders surveyed by the Public Agenda Foundation for the survey reported in WORKING WOMAN in August and September. In fact, the majority of mothers do work and—as the survey also shows—most of the work force thinks that the care of their children is being neglected and that something should be done about it. The question is, what? To answer that question intelligently, we first need to know what the child-care situation is for millions of American families in 1983. For enlightenment, WORKING WOMAN turned to one of the nation's leading authorities on the issue, Sheila B. Kamerman, DSW, professor of social policy and planning at Columbia University School of Social Work in New York. Kamerman is co-director of a major national study of child-care services, supported by the Carnegie Corporation, and author of a number of books on the subject, including "Child Care, Family Benefits and Working Parents," with Alfred J. Kahn (Columbia University Press), and "Parenting in an Unresponsive Society: Managing Work and Family Life" (Free Press). Her newest book, "Maternity Policies and Working Women," is being published this month by Columbia University Press. With a crucial Presidential-election year about to begin, Kamerman's reflections form an important part of the growing dialogue about what needs to be done for the children of working parents. Although most American politicians have largely ignored the child-care issue for more than a decade—the last child-care bill was passed by Congress in 1971 but was vetoed by President Nixon—they can afford to do so no longer.

BY SHEILA B. KAMERMAN

The long silence is over. After an absence of over a decade, child care is about to return to the national agenda. The debate is likely to be very different this time, and the upsurge of interest is occurring despite efforts in Washington during the intervening years to ignore or deny the importance of child-care services.

Ten years ago, the push for child care was a push to establish a new federal program of day-care centers, and the people behind the issue were professionals and advocates concerned about children. Today the focus no longer is just on Washington, and a broad-based constituency has emerged. At its core are working parents themselves, now an overwhelming majority of parents.

Joining with them are national women's organizations such as the Association of Junior Leagues and the National Organization for Women (NOW), women's magazines—including WORKING WOMAN—and religious organizations such as the National Council of Churches. In addition to professionals and advocates for children, for example, the Washington-based Children's Defense Fund, new groups have formed, most notably the Child Care Action Campaign, a new coalition founded by Elinor Guggenheimer to lobby Congress and spread information, which includes among its members representatives of the media, educators, professionals and a wide range of women's organizations.

The new goal goes beyond federal programs to encourage support from both private and public sectors and from every level of government—federal, state, local. What clearly is needed is more than a single national program. The push is on to increase the quantity of child-care services available, to expand access to them, to make a variety of services affordable by all who need and want them, and to improve the quality of care provided.

THE NEW REALITIES

One reason there hasn't been a strong, broad-based push for child-care services before now is that many Americans have been under the misapprehension that not many children needed them. The available services were used, it was thought, largely by welfare families and were not programs that the majority of Americans wanted to promote or to use for their own children.

Most mothers were at home taking care of their children, Americans believed. Even if mothers worked, it was only for a few hours a day, while their children were at school.

What's more, care of a child outside his or her own home—especially in some kind of group facility—was thought to be bad for children. Therefore working parents used (and preferred) relatives to care for their children while they were at work; group care was for children with problems. In any case, the consensus was that working parents had no difficulty finding child care.

One by one these myths have been exposed. Although the process still is not complete, the

[Reprinted with permission from *Working Woman*. Copyright © 1983 by HAL Publications, Inc.]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It's unlikely that employers will be able to bear a major—or even significant—portion of the child-care burden. Only very large companies can afford to fund child care, and most women work for very small companies

public is becoming aware of the new realities of family life and child rearing.

Reality number one is that most American mothers are not at home with their children. The most dramatic increase in female labor-force participation rates over the last decade has been among married women with children, in particular those with very young children. According to Elizabeth Waldman, senior economist in the division of employment and unemployment analysis of the US Bureau of Labor Statistics, the percentage of mothers of children under age 18 who are in the labor force has increased from 40 percent in 1970 to almost 60 percent in 1983—and the rate for married women with children under age 6 increased from 30 percent to 50 percent during those same years. Today, 53 percent of children in two-parent families have working mothers, including more than 46 percent of children under age 6. And most working mothers—more than 70 percent of those with school-age children and approximately 62 percent of those with preschoolers—work full time.

What's more, while some people still think of "day care" as something for poor families or families with problems, and of group care as harmful to young children, the biggest users of "preschool" programs (group child-care under educational auspices) are the nation's elite. Affluent families and highly educated parents compete with one another to enroll their 3-year-olds (and increasingly their 2-year-olds) in private nursery schools, even when the mothers are not working. They do not seem to doubt for a moment the benefits for their children of a good group experience in preschool. The available research supports their judgments. And those mothers who work full time, as many do, seek out full-day programs.

Although the number of young children in the population as a whole was substantially smaller in the 1970s, nursery-school enrollment more than doubled. National Center of Education statistics show that 53 percent of 3- to 4-year-olds in families with incomes at or above $25,000 attended a preschool program in 1982. Less than 29 percent of those from families with incomes below $25,000 were in preschool. What's more, about half of the 3-year-olds and 72 percent of the 4-year-olds whose mothers are college graduates were in such programs in 1982. As economist Mary Rowe, special assistant to the president of MIT, says, "The future child-care issue for children of this age may not be availability of care but rather accessibility and affordability."

But availability still is a problem, especially for infants and toddlers. Child-care providers throughout the country say that the greatest unmet demand for service is from parents of children under 3. Women with children of this age are the most rapidly growing part of the labor force—the proportion of these mothers in the job market has increased from 34 to 46 percent since 1975, the first year such data were published. A combination of more women working and a national maternity policy that defines maternity as a disability and limits income (and often job) protection to roughly six to eight weeks after childbirth, has led to an upsurge in the demand for places for infants.

The newest consumer group? Unborn babies, according to Robert Lurie, who heads the Summit (New Jersey) Child Care Center. "Parents come to me, almost as soon as the wife knows she is pregnant," he says. "They come to reserve a place for their child-to-be. It was parent pressure that led us to open a new service for infants aged 6 weeks to 1 year." Most parents of infants and toddlers can't find such programs—and if they do find them, they're prohibitively expensive.

Instead, these parents resort to family day-care homes to meet their child-care needs. These generally are informal arrangements in which a neighborhood woman cares for one or more children. Family day-care homes may or may not be licensed.

Finally, while some people remain convinced that it's easy for working parents to find decent child care, this isn't true. In survey after survey that our child-care project at Columbia University has reviewed, working mothers continue to list "child care" as the single most important problem they face. Daily experience backs up these findings.

Listen to any discussion in which working mothers are present and you'll hear talk about the complicated child-care packages they've had to organize in order to cover an entire day or week. The package may include care provided by the parents themselves, by other relatives, neighbors or friends, and by a variety of formal, paid arrangements—family day-care homes, preschools, nursery schools, centers and so forth. Many husbands and wives have chosen to work different shifts in order to be sure their child is cared for adequately; and some single mothers have worked out similar arrangements with relatives. The result often is a desperate juggling act.

What does all this mean? It means a new definition of child-care needs and a powerful new constituency for improving how we handle them. The old conception of child care was as a protective service for the minority of children from inadequate homes, and a caretaking service for another minority of poor children whose mothers had to work. Changes in the labor force have made it an essential service for the majority of American children—normal, average children. Their mothers work for the same financial and nonfinancial reasons that their fathers work: because they are the sole support, the primary support or a major provider for their children's economic needs, and because work constitutes an essential part of their personal identity. The issue no longer is whether we need such services, but rather how to assure access to good ones.

INFORMATION GAP

What do we know about the services that are available? This is part of what our study has been working to ascertain, and the picture is at best incomplete. We know what is available by way of nursery schools, kindergartens and primary schools, but we have very incomplete information on which of these schools provide supplementary services and what hours these are open. We know something about federally funded Head Start programs and day-care centers, but much less about the latter than we once did. Since 1981, when congressional legislation turned Title XX of the Social Security Act (which funded day-care centers) into a Social Services Block Grant, no more national information has been collected on how much of that money is used for child care, what kinds of services are provided and at what costs, and which children are receiving them. And of the vast informal market of family day-care homes—the most important type of child care for very young children and among the most important for preschool and primary-school children—we know virtually nothing. What's more, there has been no national survey of child-care services since the mid-1970s and no national survey ever of services for school-aged children.

One thing we do know: Such services are on the rise. Licensed child-care facilities increased during the 1970s—partly because of the growth in the numbers of working mothers and their demand for such care and partly because federal subsidies were available to providers caring for children of low- and moderate-income families. Even in the latter part of the decade, when funding did not keep up with inflation, the number of programs that either started subsidizing child care or were newly established grew by more than 25 percent, according to a 1981 report by the Department of Health and Human Services. Most of the federal subsidy went toward the purchase of child care from private providers (both non-profit and for-profit). In addition, a 1982 sur-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

vey by the National Council of Churches identified almost 15,000 programs under church auspices around the country that offered child-care services one-third of these programs receive some public funding

Over the decade, the proportion of children in kindergarten (largely public) increased by about one-third Nursery-school enrollment (largely private) almost doubled Preschool programs emerged as the largest single type of child-care service for 3-to-5-year-olds These often are coupled with various other types of child care to constitute a full-day child-care package Although most preschools still are only part day, the proportion of children enrolled in full-day programs has doubled, from 17 percent in 1970 to 34 percent in 1982, as more parents request this Indeed, even public kindergartens increasingly are becoming full-day rather than half-day programs

A new component among child-care services is the large regional or national commercial chains (see WORKING WOMAN, August 1983) These chains began in the 1970s and have more than doubled in size Carole Rogin, the director of the national trade association of the profit-making child-care providers, says that the profit-making centers now serve about 10 percent of all children in child care

Family day-care homes continue to be an important, but largely invisible, form of child care Only an estimated 10 percent of family day care is licensed or registered, and visible The rest is "underground," with relatively little known about it Some of the licensed homes are part of sponsored child-care "networks," often linked with local centers or preschools The US Department of Agriculture Child Care Food Program, which funds food for low-income children in both day-care centers and family day-care homes, has provided an incentive for making these caregivers more visible By far, the majority of infant and toddler care takes place in these homes

What role is business playing? Some employers have been discussing doing something about the child-care needs of their employees, but to date there has been far more talk than action A 1982 survey (the National Employer-Supported Child Care Project) identified 415 employers who were supporting some child-care-related activity—about half of these were hospitals Among the programs supported by private industry, 42 were on-site child-care services, ten were voucher programs, 103 involved support to community services, usually in the form of a modest financial contribution, and 19 were child-care information and referral services Dana Friedman, EdD, senior research fellow at the Work and Family Information Center at the Conference Board, a business-research organization in New York, reports that more employers are becoming involved all the time Nevertheless, it is unlikely that employer-sponsored child care will be the major—or even a significant—source of child care for most children Among other reasons, only very large employers can afford to provide such a benefit, and most women by far work for very small employers

Child-care services are increasing, although they are organized and delivered on a haphazard basis Which services children actually receive obviously depends on their parents' ability to pay for them This makes public funding a crucial component

ROBIN HOOD IN REVERSE

Since the Reagan administration came into office, a sweeping change in emphasis has taken place in the kinds of public monies provided for child care Direct public funding for child-care services for low-income families has fallen off sharply, at the same time, there has been a substantial increase in indirect funding of child care through tax credits that benefit middle- and upper-income Americans

The largest increase in direct public subsidies for day-care centers occurred in the early and mid-1970s with the growth of federal funds for social services By the late 70s, almost one-fifth of the federal general social-services funds (about $650 million) was spent by the states to provide licensed child care for about 750,000 low- or moderate-income children, an additional $150 million was provided by state and local funding At no time, though, did this subsidy create enough openings for all who qualified for subsidized child care

More recently, in 1981, Congress passed the Reagan administration's proposals reducing overall social-services expenditures by 21 percent, from $3 1 billion to $2 4 billion Although no firm data are available, most state social-service administrators are convinced that the proportion of these monies going to child care has declined, too Funding for the Agriculture Department's Child Care Food Program also was cut by 30 percent And the amount that working mothers on welfare were permitted to deduct from their earnings for child-care expenses (before having their welfare grant reduced) was cut to a maximum of $160 per month per child (Monthly fees for preschoolers in group facilities across the country range from $200 to $500 a month)

These cuts are in striking contrast to the hefty rise in indirect federal subsidies (tax benefits) to middle- and upper-income families The "child-care" (actually, the "dependent-care") tax credit, which first became a significant benefit in 1976, was increased as part of the 1981 Economic Recovery Tax Act Parents who earn enough to pay taxes now can take a credit of 20 to 30 percent of child-care expenses, up to a maximum of $720 on expenses of $2,400 for one child and $1,440 on expenses of $4,800 for two or more (if the parents' joint income is under $10,000) The minimum benefit—available to families with incomes above $28,000—is $480 for one child and $960 for two or more It hardly is likely, though, that a family with an income under $10,000 would spend $4,800 for child care for two children—or even $2,400 for one—the amount needed to obtain the maximum credit The estimated cost in lost tax revenue in the 1983 fiscal year because of these credits $1 5 billion Furthermore, by 1987 the Joint Committee on Taxation estimates the cost will approach $3 billion

Between eight and nine million children received some public subsidy for child care through this benefit in 1982, according to congressional tax staff A significant number of parents who qualify do not use this tax benefit, either out of ignorance or because they are using a family day-care provider who is working "off the books " Twenty-seven states also provide some tax benefits to working parents, about half tied in to the federal provision

It's not that the child-care tax credit—or any other device for defraying some of the costs of child care—is a bad thing It's that while this help is growing for middle- and upper-income families, child-care subsidies for low-income families were reduced And this is very unfair and really makes no sense at all

There is growing pressure to make this tax credit "refundable" so that low-income families who do not owe taxes could receive it as a cash benefit (A family of four needs a combined gross income of $5,400 or more to owe taxes) There also is pressure to raise to 50 percent the proportion of costs that can be reimbursed, at least for low- and moderate-income families These modifications might make this benefit more worthwhile for low-income families

The 1981 tax legislation also provided another indirect subsidy, largely to the more affluent The Dependent Care Assistance Benefit permits employers to sponsor (subsidize) child care for the child of an employee as part of their business costs and without this money being included as part of the employee's taxable income Thus far, Friedman of the Conference Board estimates that approximately 30 employers have set up such programs

Still another employee benefit is possible through legislation that permits employers to

A CAPSULE DEFINITION

Child-care services outside a child's own home may be full or part day and include

- Preschools
- Nursery schools
- Kindergartens
- Family day-care homes
- Day-care centers
- After-school programs

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

establish a fund with employees' pretax dollars and use it to purchase various services, including child care. Although the IRS has not yet issued regulations approving such plans, a few employers are looking into the idea. Both of these benefits, even if available more extensively, accrue primarily to those with good jobs.

This movement from direct to indirect public subsidies in the 1980s has had three significant effects. One result is that the greater benefits are going to the more affluent families. A second, related consequence has been to increase the diversity of child-care services, and a third is that most of the recent growth in the supply of child-care services has been in the private sector, much of it profit-making.

NEW APPROACHES

The newest element in the child-care scene is the I&R (information and referral) service—a network created to improve the "match" or "fit" between parents and the growing variety of licensed child-care providers. I&Rs also work to educate parents/consumers about the characteristics of a high-quality child-care service, while leaving to the parent the ultimate decision of which service to choose.

California is the only state thus far that provides a public subsidy for I&R services. Fifty-five such Resource and Referral programs (as California calls them) now are in operation, according to Patty Siegel, director of the California Resource and Referral Network; an additional 165 are operating nationwide. A few employers also have established such services for their employees, as a low-cost alternative to the direct sponsorship or operation of a child-care program.

A recent development that makes these services even more important is a growing move on the part of some states and localities to allow eligible parents to spend their social-services child-care allotment on the child-care program of their choice. This approach is described under a variety of labels including "vouchering" (several states), "purchase of care" (Florida) and "alternative payment" (California). The stated object is to use these scarce public monies more efficiently by cutting administrative costs, and, ostensibly, to give parents access to a wider range of services.

Ideally, the services that parents can purchase with these vouchers are prescreened to assure at least a minimum level of quality (for example, licensed care). In our own study at Columbia, we have found that this is not always the case.

Consumer subsidies alone may not provide enough of an incentive to ensure the availability of inexpensive, good-quality services in low-income neighborhoods. In Houston, Texas, according to Kathleen McNemar, director of day care at Neighborhood Center, Inc., a nonprofit social-service agency, the state continues to fund some low-income centers directly in communities where the existing supply of centers is inadequate. Where enough good child care exists, the state provides vouchers.

Women are in the labor force to stay—in fact, the projections are for female labor-force participation rates to continue to increase during the 1980s, although at a slower pace than during the 70s. Women who are pregnant or have very young children are likely to continue to work. And the need for services to care for their children will grow, too.

WHAT'S AHEAD?

Given the current political situation in Washington, it seems unlikely that federal subsidies for child care will increase significantly, except indirectly, through the tax system. At present, the tax credit is a relatively modest subsidy for middle- and high-income families. If existing public child-care funds are turned into vouchers for low-income families, probably they will not provide enough money to permit these families access to the quality of child-care services available to the affluent. Nor are private, philanthropic or corporate funds likely to make up the difference for such parents—or to provide help for those middle-income families who do not qualify for federal and state subsidies. At the very least, the child-care tax credit should be made refundable and the benefit level raised.

Some states and localities are beginning to expand their kindergarten and preschool programs, but public programs for 3- to 4-year-olds still are in very short supply. After-school programs are emerging in several communities, but again the development is limited. The recent national focus on inadequacies in our educational system may lead to more support for public preschools, but there is little evidence of this support as yet.

Good child care is not cheap. Our study shows that costs range widely, depending on the type of care provided and the region of the country. In Orlando, Florida, and Rochester, New York, care for a preschooler is about $45 a week and for an infant/toddler, it's $55 a week. By contrast, in Summit, New Jersey, and Philadelphia the costs are $75 a week for a preschooler, $96 for a toddler (in New Jersey), $126 for an infant. Much of what is available now is priced beyond what most parents can afford.

The difference in costs is largely a matter of the salaries paid to staff. Higher salaries usually reflect a higher level of training among caregivers in a part of the country where wages are high. Staff/child ratios affect costs, too. Thus the states that require higher proportions of staff to children are likely to have more expensive child care. In general, family day care is much less expensive, usually because the caregivers charge little for their own time and skill.

The major focus in recent years has been on increasing the amount of child-care services, and there has been some success in this; there is likely to be more. The new emphasis is on increasing access and affordability. Here, we have a long way to go—particularly if we are not to create a two-tier system, in which the more affluent use preschool programs for their 2- to 5-year-olds and in-home caretakers or high-quality group programs for their infants and toddlers, while lower-income families increasingly are directed to family day care.

And then there's quality, an issue that is being virtually ignored. Federal standards for child-care services were eliminated when Congress passed the Reagan administration's social-services block-grant legislation, and now it is up to the states to set such standards and enforce them. Many states have inadequate standards and even those standards may be applicable only to a small proportion of child-care programs. What's more, some states do not enforce the standards they do have. One current view is that service quality will improve as competition increases among providers. That has not yet happened.

Family day care, the major resource for the very young, remains largely invisible. In order to increase the supply and accessibility of such care, many jurisdictions are shifting from largely unenforced licensing provisions to less onerous registration (self-listing and self-assessment of quality by the provider). The consequences of such shifts are unknown.

Ultimately, the value of good-quality child care and its concomitant costs will need to be addressed. The Reagan administration has begun to talk about child care as one of its new "women's initiatives." So far there is no sign of proposals for more adequate funding, and certainly no attention to the problems of low-income families. Unless the issue of affordability is addressed, the costs of such care will continue to be borne by parents or by caregivers (in the form of very low salaries or unrealistically low charges for family day care).

Some of us are convinced that the whole society has a stake in how children grow up and the kinds of adults they become—and thus in how they are cared for when they are young. If more people become convinced of this, there may be support for a more substantial investment in child care. If not, given the high costs of good care and the limited ability of most parents to pay, we may increase the quantity of care available and extend access somewhat (both laudable goals). But the quality of care will remain an unaddressed issue—solved now, in part, by the inadequate pay for caregivers, usually women, and in part by less than desirable care for children. This is a very strange outcome for a rich society, allegedly concerned with children and said to lead the world in child-development research. ■

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chairman Miller. Thank you.
Dr. Zigler.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD F. ZIGLER, PH.D., STERLING PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY AND HEAD OF THE PSYCHOLOGY SECTION, YALE CHILD STUDY CENTER, DIRECTOR, BUSH CENTER IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL POLICY, YALE UNIVERSITY

Mr. Zigler. Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to testify before this committee. Let us start with a little history, because I have been a player for a good number of years in this field. Let us go back to 1970.

The White House Conference on Children at that time noted the need for good quality child care as the No. 1 problem facing American families. Unfortunately, no national effort to meet this need was put into place at that time, and over the intervening 14 years the problem has worsened.

Currently, more than half of the mothers whose children are too young to care for themselves are working outside the home, and our best extrapolation is that by the end of this century this figure will top 75 percent. We must be very clear that for most of these mothers staying home to care for their children full time is simply not economically realistic.

In modern America mothers work for the same reason fathers do—economic necessity. Many more families would be living at the poverty level if they did not have two parents in the labor force, and one-fifth of American children now reside in single parent households where a mother's income is often their only source of support. Because of these dramatic changes in the demographics of American family life, there are now approximately 6 million children under 13 being cared for by others so that their parents can work.

Now, should parents be concerned about the growth and development of young children in such care? What type of citizens will our Nation have in the coming decades? The answer to whether we should be concerned or not depends upon a number of factors, especially the quality and kind of care the child receives and also, perhaps, the age of the child.

Most child care experts now believe that high quality supplemental care produces no ill effects on the cognitive or socioemotional development of the toddlers and children experiencing such care. However, in regard to the effects of child care on children in the first year of life, no consensus has developed. Nonetheless, there is a large and quickly growing demand for such care, as Dr. Kamerman has pointed out to us. In fact, it is the fastest growing type of child care in the United States.

The controversy between those who give infant day care a clean psychological bill of health and those who do not has become rather heated, with very prominent workers on both sides of the issue. I am currently involved in a review and reanalysis of the literature on the effects of infant day care. Our preliminary sense is that the risks of infant group care seem to increase when the child is also experiencing other life stresses such as father absence, poverty or unstable care arrangements.

However, our chief concern is that infants are simply more vulnerable than are older children. Therefore, it is necessary to have at least one staff member for every three infants, to have staff reasonably well trained, to have strict sanitation and infection control procedures, to have small group size and so on. All of this costs money, with infant care costing upwards from $5,200 per year in most metropolitan areas.

Currently the tax laws allow a lower middle class family a child care credit which amounts to 30 percent of the first $2,400 they spend on supplemental child care. This credit is welcome relief and is reasonable for families with preschool and school-aged children, but it does not go very far in deferring the higher cost of infant care. Therefore, I am suggesting that the amount of tax credit available should be higher for parents of infants than for parents of school age children.

Even if high quality infant care were affordable, many parents and professionals would still be concerned about the potential effects of separating parents and infants in the first few weeks and months of life. Hence, I would also like to suggest that the Federal Government begin to investigate the feasibility of a policy of part-paid infant care leaves, commonplace in Europe and Canada.

Infant care leaves are typically financed by employer-employee contributions, with some government incentive. If America had such a policy, many new parents would not be faced with having to choose one of two unacceptable alternatives—that is, one of them quitting a job or, second, placing their very young infant into out-of-home care arrangements.

Another issue confronting parents is whether to choose family child care, in which one adult cares for several nonrelated children in her own home, or center care, where a number of adults care for larger numbers of children in a central location. Currently more children are placed in family day care homes than in large centers, but the issue of which type of setting is best for children remains an open question, one that should have been settled long ago but has not been.

There is some evidence, provided by Sandra Scarr's research group, that for children under three family day care homes may be superior in many ways. On the other hand, Mary Keyserling, in her work "Windows on Day Care," points out serious problems with family day care. The major problem is the difficulty of controlling the quality of family day care.

It is very likely that both the best and worst of day care situations take place in family day care homes. The vast majority are unlicensed and unmonitored. The Federal role should involve providing seed money and incentive to the States to increase the visibility of family day care homes and encourage licensure or registration of them.

One noteworthy approach to family day care, such as the Pacific Oaks model, involves clustering family day care homes into networks where they can provide mutual support to one another, helping to assure quality of care.

Most recent discussions of day care have focused on children of preschool age. However, we should not lose sight of the fact that about two-thirds of the need for day care is for school-age children, ages 6 to 11. An estimated 2 to 4 million, and, as Dr. Kamerman points out, we do not know the exact number, but an estimated 2 to 4 million, of such children are left alone to fend for themselves for a significant portion of each day.

These latchkey children are more vulnerable to injury from accidents and from sexual and other kinds of assault. A relatively inexpensive solution to this problem, which Dr. Kamerman has already recommended and which I also put before you, would be parent-school partnerships in which the school buildings, which are already housing these children for most of the day, are used to house them for a few more hours.

These extra hours should be supervised not by teachers, which would be too expensive, but by a child development associate, a graduate of a much shorter competency-based program. This is one area in which the Reagan administration has provided important leadership, especially through the efforts of the Office of Human Development under Dorcas Hardy.

OHD has recently distributed an RFP designed to assist States and municipalities in the identification and implementation of effective school-age day care programs. This effort by Health and Human Services should come to your attention and should certainly be expanded. It is a target of very high opportunity, because it is very cost-effective to provide day care for this age child.

It is clear that modern American society is not in the position of choosing for or against supplemental care for a large percentage of its children. The only operative questions have to do with affordability and quality. The current situation forces too many children into less than adequate child care arrangements, and the research concerning the negative effects of inadequate care is clear.

Inadequate child care has lasting negative effects on the intellectual and socio-emotional development of the children experiencing such care. It has been associated with cognitive and language deficits, as well as difficulties with social relationships. It would be irresponsible for us to fail to choose for the availability of high quality supplemental child care for all of America's children who need it.

Child development experts have pretty sound ideas about what constitutes good quality of care. That is not the problem. The problem is whether we have the will and the imagination to develop social policy that makes such care available.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Edward Zigler follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PROF. EDWARD ZIGLER

In 1970, the White House Conference on Children noted the need for good quality child care as the number one problem facing American families. Unfortunately, no national effort to meet this need was put into place at that time. Over the intervening 14 years, the problem has worsened, as more and more mothers have begun to work outside the home. Currently, more than half of the mothers whose children are too young to care for themselves are in the labor force, and our best extrapolation is that by the end of the century, the figure will top 75%. We must be very clear that for most of these mothers staying home to care for their children full time is simply not economically realistic. In modern America mothers work for the same reason fathers do: economic necessity. The bulk of current American middle-class families have achieved their standard of living through both parents in the family working. Many more families would be living at the poverty level if mothers were not in the labor force. You must remember that one-fifth of American children now reside in single parent households and mother's income is often their only source of support. Because of these dramatic changes in the demographics of American family life there are now approximately 6 million children under 13 being cared for by others so that their parents can work.

Should parents be concerned about the growth and development of young children who in large part are being cared for by non-parental adults? The answer depends upon a number of factors, especially the quality and kind of care the child receives and also, perhaps, the age of the child. Most child care experts now believe that high quality supplemental care provided to toddlers and children from relatively unstressed and stable family situations probably produces no ill effects on the cognitive or socio-emotional development of the children experiencing such care.

However, in regard to supplemental care in early infancy (that is, the first year of life), no consensus has developed. What is clear is that there is a large and quickly growing demand for such care, in fact it is the fastest growing type of child care in the United States (Jones, E., & Prescott, E., 1982). [1] The controversy between those who give infant day care a clean psychological bill of health and those who do not has become rather heated, with very prominent workers on both sides of the issue. I am currently involved in a review and reanalysis of the literature on the effects of infant day care with Thomas Gamble at Yale. As of this writing, we remain rather less sanguine than most of our colleagues about the benign effects of group care for infants. Chances of negative effects accruing to infants experiencing such care seem to increase as a function of the number and magnitude of other life stresses (such as father absence, poverty, unstable substitute care arrangements, etc.).

However, our chief concern is that achieving even minimal conditions of quality for infant care is very expensive. The problem is that infants are simply more vulnerable than are older children, making it necessary to have at least one staff member for every three infants, to have staff reasonably well trained, to have strict sanitation and infection control procedures, to have small group size and so on. All this costs money, with infant care costing upward of $5200 per year in most metropolitan areas. Most parents cannot afford to pay that much, and providers cannot afford to charge less. This leads to my first suggestion. Currently, the tax laws allow a lower-middle class family a child care credit which amounts to 30% of the first $2,400 they spend on supplemental child care. This is welcome relief and is reasonable in regard to the average cost of care for pre-school and school aged children. But in regard to the more expensive infant care, it does not go nearly far enough. Therefore, I am suggesting that the amount of tax credit available should be higher for parents of infants.

Even if high quality infant day care were affordable, this does not allay the fear that many parents and professionals have about the potential effects of separating parents and infants in the first weeks and months of life. Hence, I would also like to suggest that the federal government begin to investigate the feasibility of a policy of part-paid infant care leaves. Such policies are commonplace in Europe and Canada. They are typically financed by employer-employee contributions, with some government incentive. If America had such a policy, many new parents would not be faced with having to choose one of two unacceptable alternatives; that is, one of them quitting a job, producing a significant drop in income, or placing their very young infant into out-of-home care arrangements. Our current sense is that most young families would prefer an infant care leave to placing their newborn in a day care center.

Another issue confronting parents is whether to choose family child care, in which one adult cares for several non-related children in her own home, or center care, where a number of adults care for larger numbers of children in a central location. Currently, more children are placed in family day care homes than in large centers, but the question of which type of setting is best for children remains an open question—one that should have been settled long ago, but has not been. There is some evidence, provided by Sandra Scarr's research group, that for children under three, family day care homes may be superior in many ways (McCartney, K., et al., 1982). [2] On the other hand, Mary Keyserling (1982) in *Windows on Day Care* [3] points out serious problems with family day care.

The major problem is the difficulty of controlling the quality of family day care. It is very likely that both the best and worst of day care situations take place in family day care homes. The vast majority are unlicensed. They are difficult to license, much less to monitor, because there are so many, and because many of them go in and out of business rapidly. The Federal role should involve providing seed money and incentives to the states to increase the visibility of family day care homes and to encourage licensure or registration of them. One noteworthy approach to family day care, such as the Pacific Oaks model, involves clustering family day care into networks where they can provide mutual support to one another, helping to assure quality of care. It is also important to start educating parents about what to look for in regard to the quality and safety of such arrangements for their children.

Most recent discussions of day care have focused on children of pre-school age. However, we should not lose sight of the fact that about two-thirds of the need for day care is for school aged children (6–11) whose parents both work. An estimated 2–4 million such children are left alone to fend for themselves for a significant portion of each day (School-Age Child Care Project, 1982). [4] These "latchkey" children are more vulnerable to injury from accidents and from sexual and other kinds of assault. For this age group, I believe that there is a relatively inexpensive solution to the problem. The solution involves parent-school partnerships in which the school buildings, which are already housing these children for most of the day, are used to house them for a few more hours. These extra hours should be supervised not by teachers (which would be too expensive) but by a Child Development Associate, a graduate of a much shorter competency-based program. This is one area in which the Reagan Administration has provided important leadership, especially through the efforts of the Office of Human Development under Dorcas Hardy. OHD has recently distributed an RFP designed to assist states and municipalities in the identification and implementation of effective school age daycare programs.

It is clear that modern American society is not in the position of choosing for or against supplemental care for a large percentage of its children. The only operative questions have to do with affordability and quality. The current situation forces too many children into less than adequate child care arrangements, and the research concerning the negative effects of inadequate care is clear. Inadequate day care has lasting negative effects on the intellectual and socio-emotional development of the children experiencing such care. It has been associated with cognitive and language deficits, as well as deficits in regard to social relations with parents and unfamiliar adults. It would be irresponsible for us to fail to choose for the availability of high quality supplemental child care for all of America's children who need it. Child development experts have pretty sound ideas about what constitutes quality of care, that's not the problem. The problem is whether we have the will and the imagination to develop social policy that makes such care available.

REFERENCES

1. Jones, E., & Prescott, E. (1982). Day care: Short- or long-term solution? *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 461,* May, 91–101.
2. McCartney, K., Scarr, S., Phillips, D., Grajek, S., & Schwarz, J. C. (1982). Environmental differences among day care centers and their effects on children's development. In E. Zigler & E. W. Gordon (Eds.), *Day Care: Scientific and Social Policy Issues.* Boston, MA: Auburn House.
3. Keyserling, M. D. (1972). *Windows on Day Care.* New York: National Council of Jewish Women.
4. School-Age Child Care Project. (1982). School-age child care. In E. Zigler & E. W. Gordon (Eds.), *Day Care: Scientific and Social Policy Issues.* Boston: Auburn House.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you.
Dr. Tompkins.

STATEMENT OF RACHEL TOMPKINS, ED.D., DIRECTOR, CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND, WASHINGTON, DC

Ms. TOMPKINS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Rachel Tompkins, executive director of the Children's Defense Fund. I am testifying today on behalf of our president, Marian Wright Edelman, who sadly is unable to be here.

CDF is delighted that the committee is beginning its discussion of child care and providing a public forum in which we can debate policies that affect many American families. The supply of child care lags so far behind the demand that more than one in six American children 13 years old and under may be going without care. The need for infant care and after-school care has been highlighted by the other two witnesses. I will not go into any of the numbers that are in my written testimony.

Mothers work out of economic necessity. Close to one-fifth of all families with children under 18 years of age are headed by women with no husband present. Married women are also essential providers of family income. Among married women who work outside the home, 27 percent have husbands who earn less than $10,000, 73 percent have husbands who earn less than $20,000. The average single mother with children is far worse off, earning only $9,495 in 1981.

As Harper's magazine describes it, 80 percent of American working women are employed in traditional women's jobs. They spend their days waiting on tables, typing letters, emptying bedpans and cleaning offices. On the average they earn just over $10,000 a year. You cannot buy very much child care on that kind of salary.

The lack of affordable child care is a major factor in keeping women and children in poverty. A Census Bureau survey determined recently that 45 percent of single women with children and 36 percent of low-income women with family incomes under $15,000 would work if child care were available at a reasonable cost.

Lack of affordable child care also restricts the training and educational opportunities that allow women to advance and perhaps earn the additional income that would allow them to purchase quality child care. One of every five or six women is unemployed because she is unable to make satisfactory child care arrangements.

Let me give you an example that is typical of many of the women who are seeking child care. In Washington State a single parent mother with three young children ages 8, 4, and 1 has been struggling to keep her family together and to move off welfare. A year and a half ago because she had problems with alcohol she placed her 4-year-old in foster care. She turned to Alcoholics Anonymous for help. She got help through that and some other programs.

She got her life together. She got her son back home. She got a scholarship to attend a beauty school. However, the lack of child care for mothers on AFDC who are enrolled in training programs in Washington State has not made it possible to take advantage of the scholarship. She has been a real advocate. She has gone to a lot of people for help. However, the policy remains and she cannot move ahead to gain the skills that she needs. She continues today on welfare.

Obviously child care is a shared responsibility between families, the Government, and the private sector. However, there is simply no doubt that low income women must have help from the Government if they are to be able to purchase quality child care.

The average costs for child care are high. The range of costs we have for child care ranges from the very lowest of $1,200 a year for family day care up to over $5,000 a year if the child is in center-based case. If we look again at the income level of the families we are talking about, around $10,000, it becomes very clear that it is extremely difficult to purchase adequate care.

Naturally it hits the poorest families the hardest. More than one-fifth of all children live in households with incomes below the poverty level. Dr. Kamerman has pointed out the danger of the two-tier system. This is something we are very concerned about.

The statistics on the numbers of 3- and 4-year-old children from middle and upper income families who are in preschool programs compared to the number of low income poor children who are in those programs is of great concern to us.

The dependent care tax credit, our largest Federal program, costs about $1.5 billion. It is available to all families regardless of income and it provides important help to lower middle income families. But it will not affect this discrepancy described by Dr. Kamerman. Low income families have limited disposable income. They cannot purchase child care up front and then receive it as a tax credit. That does not help them sufficiently.

A woman earning $10,000 a year would have to pay approximately 25 percent of her income, or $2,400, to purchase center-based care. That is more than twice as much as the 10 percent of income that is considered reasonable for child care expenditures.

These problems are also exacerbated by the fact that over the last 3 years existing child care supports for low-income families have been drastically cut. Title XX was cut by 21 percent in 1981. The other direct subsidy for child care programs, the child care food program, was also cut in 1981. The impact of that has been demonstrated in a study that the Children's Defense Fund did of all 50 States on the effects of the title XX cutbacks on child care.

Thirty-two States are providing title XX child care to fewer children in 1983 than they did in 1981. Thirty-one States have altered their eligibility standards and made it harder for families to become eligible. Nineteen States have increased fees. Twenty-four States have reduced funds for training. Thirty-three States have lowered their standards and 10 States have been creative and have shifted from providing child care to low-income families through title XX to reimbursing those families for their child care expenses through AFDC title IV-A child care disregard.

Under the disregard, the family makes its own child care arrangements, pays for the child care out of pocket, and then those expenses are disregarded or subtracted from their earned income when calculating their AFDC payment. This results then in the family receiving a larger AFDC grant or, thus, a "reimbursement" for their child care costs.

The problems with this are, again, the disposable income problem. The family has limited income to pay for child care up front. Second, they are limited to a maximum child care disregard of $160, regardless of the cost of care. Families have to locate their own sources of care, which often are not required to meet any standards of quality.

Child care providers operate on a very limited margin. They are low income operations themselves. They cannot afford to carry families who cannot pay for a couple of months. And AFDC benefits in States are simply intolerably low, forcing the families to choose between child care and basic health and food.

Because of the method in which the child care disregard is used to calculate, there is a Catch-22 which means that families may even get less income when the AFDC disregard is used than when title XX is used to provide child care.

What do all these changes mean in terms of children? They mean that a large number of children have lost child care in the last couple of years. Between 8,000 and 12,000 New York State children have lost day care purchased for them by public funds. Illinois has gone from serving 28,000 to serving 18,000. Delaware has halved its subsidized slots from 2,000 to 995. Virginia has gone from serving 19,000 to 15,000. It goes on and on. They have done this by a variety of means, but fewer children are being served.

Second, the budget cuts have fueled the development of the two-tier system. In order to keep their doors open, some child care centers have begun to serve fewer low income children and families. New policies have eliminated child care for these families or resulted in fees that poor families cannot pay. Programs are simply taking fewer subsidized children. We have many examples of that from around the country in our testimony.

Another thing that is happening that is of great concern is that children are being shifted to less supportive child care arrangements. Given the testimony of the two earlier witnesses about the importance of quality care, this is something that is of great importance to us. It is estimated that one-sixth of children affected by the funding cuts, over the last 2 years in New York State are being regularly left unsupervised.

In my own home State of West Virginia, 739 West Virginia families lost child care. Some 565 of these families responded to a questionnaire recently regarding their current child care arrangements. A total of 391 children had experienced some kind of change in child care arrangements.

What that means to a 2-year-old or a 3-year-old or 4-year-old who is leaving a known, comfortable child care arrangement with an adult that has been caring for them and going to some new place is hard to describe, but it is important to try to understand.

Seventy-nine of those children in the West Virginia study were caring for themselves. There is no more poignant example of the lack of care than in John Merrow's film, "Your Children, Our Children"—the child care film in that series of seven that is now on public television.

It shows a 6-year-old now caring for his 17-month-old sister while the mother works at a fast food restaurant. The only alternative she had between 3:00 and 6:00 p.m. in the afternoon was to have a 6-year-old care for the 17-month-old.

We did not have a good system to begin with. Our patchwork child care system has always been terribly inadequate. Although many families using Title XX child care are headed by single women, short-sighted policies limit child care for mothers enrolled in school or training programs, denying them the opportunity to gain the skills necessary to move out of poverty, to have a shot at the jobs that provide higher income that would allow them to buy child care and move toward self sufficiency. We give women a little bit in these situations but not enough to have them really make it.

Child care is also subsidized by the low wages of workers. Two out of three center-based care givers earn wages below the poverty level, while 87 percent of family day care providers earn below the minimum wage.

Let me say a word about the private sector and child care. An expanded private sector role in child care is vital. If we are going to have a patchwork quilt of child care services in this country—and in some ways it makes a great deal of sense. There are diverse needs out there and so having a lot of patches that cover those needs makes a lot of sense, but let us be realistic about the role of the private sector.

Dr. Kamerman has provided a great deal of information on this. If the private sector's role is not accompanied by an expanded public role, millions of lower and lower middle income families and children will be without adequate child care support. The majority of employer-sponsored child care is indeed in hospitals, places where there is a need to attract employees by providing incentives.

When child care is provided in an on-site center, its costs can be beyond the reach of lower income employees. Senator Hatch held a hearing this November on private sector initiatives. The two companies testifying highlight the problem. Both First Atlanta Bank and Zale Corporation do not offer employees a reduced rate through a sliding scale. This means that the lowest income employees of those two firms are frozen out of the on-site center.

For many firms employing low skilled workers and suffering from the effects of the recession, new benefits are the last issue to be brought to the bargaining table. In fact, employers are increasingly offering child care assistance through salary reduction plans which again are most beneficial to higher income families.

If you make $100,000 a year and you employ a $10,000 a year housekeeper, you can take a $5,000 a year writeoff on your taxes. But it does not help much for those women, the majority of whom are earning less than $15,000 a year. In addition, 50 percent of American workers are employed by firms with fewer than 100 workers. Small firms usually cannot afford this kind of experimentation unless positive outcomes can be reasonably expected.

Information and referral, which is definitely needed in most communities across America, is very helpful if there is care out there that is available and affordable. But an information and referral system that helps someone find absolutely the most wonderful child care in the world and that they cannot afford does not help very much.

A recent study by Kristin Anderson of 10 industries in New York City looking at the attitudes and practices of 80 city employers and 5 unions discovered that on the whole companies are cautious about proceeding and waiting to see what other companies in their field do.

Her final recommendation was interesting. It is critical that the business community play a role in impressing on Federal, State and city government that it is in business' best interest for government to continue and expand subsidized child care services. The role of business in providing child care assistance will continue to expand, but public and private complementarity is essential if New

York City is to have child care system that equitably addresses the child care needs of all working parents.

There is no easy way out of the enormous dilemma we face, both in terms of the accessibility and affordability of child care. Public investment is essential if lower middle income and lower income families are to meet their child care needs. It is another one of those investments in children that is worth making not only for our future but also for the current needs of workers today.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Rachel Tompkins follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RACHEL TOMPKINS, ED.D., EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I am executive director of the Children's Defense Fund. CDF is a national public charity created to provide a long-range and systematic voice on behalf of the nation's children. We are organized into four program areas: education, child health, child welfare, and child care and family support services. We address these issues through research, public education, monitoring of federal and state administrative and legislative policies and practices, network building, technical assistance to national state, and local group, litigation, community organizing, and formation of specific issue coalitions.

We are heartened that the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families has decided to focus on child care and to provide a forum to discuss possible solutions to a serious problem shared by many American families.

The supply of child care lags so far behind the demand that more than one in six American children 13 years old and under, including many preschoolers, may be going without care. The need for infant care is steadily climbing as is the demand for after-school programs so that young children are not left waiting up to four hours a day in empty homes, in school yards, or on neighborhood streets while parents work. The labor force participation of mothers with children has increased dramatically in the last forty years. Only 19 percent of women with children under age 18 were in the labor force in 1947; in contrast, 60 percent of these women were employed in 1982—a threefold increase in about 30 years. As more and more parents of young children work, child care needs will become an even greater problem.

Forty one percent of mothers with children under one are in the labor force.

Almost 46 percent of mothers with children under age three are in the labor force.

Almost 57 percent of mothers with children ages three to five are in the labor force.

By 1990 at least half of all preschool children—11.5 million—will have mothers in the labor force, as will about 60 percent—17.2 million—of all school-age children.

Child care is important to many families:

Each year 600,000 babies are born to teenage girls. Without child care these young mothers will find it nearly impossible to return to school and complete their education.

There are approximately 500,000 handicapped children under age six and 3.7 million handicapped school-age children in this country whose parents need adequate child care so they can work to help meet their children's special needs.

There are over 600,000 abused and neglected children in America who need child care to protect them from harm and to prevent either a recurrence of abuse or the need to separate them from their families.

Mothers work out of economic necessity:

Close to one-fifth of all families with children under 18 years of age are headed by women, with no husband present. Among blacks, 44 percent of children live with their mother only. These female heads of households are the principal sources of support for their families. Married women are also essential providers of family income. Among married women who work outside the home, 27 percent have husbands who earn less than $10,000, 51 percent have husbands who earn less than $15,000, and 73 percent have husbands who earn less than $20,000.

The average single mother with children is far worse off earning only $9,495 in 1981.

As Harper's magazine describes it "Eighty percent of American working women are employed in traditional women's jobs. They spend their days waiting on tables, typing letters, emptying bedpans, and cleaning offices. On average, they earn just over $10,000 a year".

Lack of affordable child care is a major factor in keeping women and children in poverty:

A recent Census Bureau survey asked women who were not in the labor force whether they would work if child care were available at a reasonable cost. Forty-five percent of single women replied yes as did 36 percent of low-income women with family incomes under $15,000. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights notes that the inability to locate affordable child care restricts not only women's employment and training opportunities but also their ability to participate in federally supported education programs. A number of studies have shown that approximately one of every five or six women is unemployed because she is unable to make satisfactory child care arrangements. The unemployment rate for single mothers with children under six is nearly 20 percent.

A mother in Massachusetts talks about the importance of child care to her ability to work:

"Things are very difficult for me financially right now, but I'm glad I have not lost my day care totally, as I thought I might at one point last year. I need day care so I can work and attend school. Even though the incentive is not there to work, I felt trapped in the welfare system. Day care has given me the freedom to get an education so that I can get employment and some day get totally out of the welfare system."

Secretary Margaret Heckler shares this mother's sentiments: "Availability of adequate day care is an essential element if welfare mothers or others with young childern are to work."

Child care help for mothers seeking to gain the training necessary to obtain jobs and income to move their families out of poverty is hard to find:

The following mothers are not atypical:

A Washington State single parent mother with three young children ages eight, four, and one struggled to keep her family together and move off dependence on welfare. A year and a half ago, she placed her four year old in foster care because she could not handle his discipline problems. She turned to Alcoholics Anonymous to help her cope with her own alcohol problem. A parent-aide volunteer group also helped her. She grew stronger and took her son back home. She also received a scholarship to attend a beauty school. However, the lack of child care for mothers on AFDC who are enrolled in training programs in Washington has not made it possible for her to take advantage of the scholarship. She sought to get child care help turning to legislators and others. However, the policy remains and she cannot move ahead to gain the skills she needs to move off dependence on welfare.

Jane Anderson had a baby in the fall of her senior year in high school. She earned her high school diploma by attending special classes for adolescent parents that included a nursery for the babies. Jane's married the baby's father but it did not work and Jane left home with her child.

After a year of dependence on AFDC Jane decided to go to a school so she could eventually support her child and herself. In May she applied for an educational grant and got on the waiting list for child care assistance so she could to to school in September. When she checked on child care assistance in August she was told that funds were still not available. In November a staff member called Jane and told her funds were available. Jane reported that she had forfeited her educational grants because she could not pay for child care herself.

Mrs. Brown's husband left her with two preschool children. She tried to find a job to support the children and herself. Because she lacked formal training or special skills the jobs open to her were at the minimum wage level. Her gross income would be $580 and her child care would cost $365. Taxes and work expenses would take up part of the remaining $215. She wants to work to preserve her self-esteem and dignity so she applied for child care assistance. Her name was added to the waiting list and she was advised that it might be a year before funds were available for her child care. Mrs. Brown then decided to go to school so she could increase her job potential. She needed child care assistance in order to go to school and, again, her name was put on the waiting list and she was told she may have to wait for a year. To survive financially, Mrs. Brown applied for and received AFDC payments of $500 a month.

Obviously, child care is a shared responsibility between families, the government, and the private sector. However, there is no doubt low-income women must have help from the government if they are to be able to purchase quality child care:

Average costs for child care are high.

AVERAGE CHILD CARE COSTS

Infant (under 2 years)—group or center: $3,000–$5,000 per year; family day care: $1,800–$3,500 per year.

Child (3–5 years)—group or center: $2,200–$3,200 per year; family day care: $1,200–$2,200 per year.

Child (school age)—$10–$50 per week.

These costs naturally hit the poor the hardest. More than one fifth of all children live in households with incomes below the poverty level. Among blacks, 40.7 percent of all families with children live below the poverty level. The poverty level of single-parent families headed by women is particularly high: more than 27 percent of white female-headed single-parent families are below the poverty line, as are a staggering 56.2 percent of black families headed by women alone.

These high costs of care are contributing to a two tier system of care for our youngest children:

According to Dr. Sheila Kamerman: "Enrollment rates of children in preschool programs are significantly higher when mothers have larger income and more education. Fifty-three percent of three to four years olds with median or higher incomes attended a preschool program in 1982 as contrasted with only 29 percent of those in lower-income families. Enrollment rates increase as mother's education levels rise and still more when mothers are employed. Not only is there growing use of preschool as a child care service for the three, four, and five year olds with working mothers, but there is an especially high use by affluent, educated, working families. Because most of these programs are private and relatively expensive, such high use by the more affluent raises serious questions about the consequences for those children in lower-income families without access to such programs whether or not their mothers work."

A Dependent Care Tax Credit, which is our largest child care program, costing almost $1.5 billion, and available to all families regardless of income can provide important help to lower-middle income families but it will not affect the discrepancy which is described by Dr. Kamerman. Families with limited disposable income are simply not the primary beneficiaries of this approach to subsidy. A woman earning $10,000 a year would have to pay approximately 30 percent of her income or $3,000 to purchase center based care. This is three times as much as the ten percent of income that is considered reasonable for child care expenses. Young mothers enrolled in school or training programs with limited or no incomes cannot use a tax credit to help them meet their child care needs.

The need for direct support is highlighted in the experience of the Dade County Florida school system when it opened a county-wide after-school program. It leads to a concern that after-school child care may also be a service primarily geared to middle-income families. Unless a subsidy is available, lower-income families do not have the surplus income to pay the extra $15 to $25 a week for these programs. One hundred-ten of Dade County's public elementary schools are running self-supporting after-school programs. But only 6,000 children out of a projected 9,000 are attending. Enrollment is lowest in the district's poorest schools where parents cannot pick up the $15 a week per child enrollment fee. There is no sliding scale which takes income or number of children in the family enrolled into consideration. We hear similar reports from child care providers who have unsuccessfully attempted to set up school-age programs in low-income neighborhoods without subsidies to families.

Existing child care supports for low-income families have been drastically cut:

At CDF, we were concerned about what was happening to child care support for families at the lower end of the economic spectrum. There are only two federal programs providing significant direct support for child care. The Child Care Food Program which funds meals to children in child care centers and family day care homes was cut by 30 percent in 1981. The Title XX Social Services Block Grant was reduced by 21 percent. We decided to focus on Title XX as the most important federal source of this support. We surveyed 46 states and the District of Columbia to determine the impact of the cuts in Title XX on child care. The results were alarming and contribute to the concern about a dual system of child care. The 21 percent in Title XX has triggered equivalent or greater cuts in state child care systems throughout the country: 32 states are providing Title XX child care to fewer children in 1983 than in 1981 and have cut their Title XX expenditures for child care. 16 states have cut Title XX expenditures for child care more than 21 percent; 31 states have accomplished reductions in the number of children served by making it harder for families to become eligible; 19 states have increased fees for services, imposed minimum fees or allowed copayments for Title XX child care; 24 states have reduced funds for training child care workers; 33 states have lowered their child care standards for Title XX programs; 10 states have shifted from providing child care to low-income working families on AFDC through Title XX to reimbursing these families for their child care expenses through AFDC's Title IV-A Child Care Disregard. However, this program is not equally beneficial to families because of many problems, including the fact that it forces very poor families to choose between paying a child care provider and basic necessities such as food, clothing and medical care.

A move by a number of states to support our lowest income children—those whose families need AFDC—through the Title IV-A Child Care Disregard is troubling:

Since 1981 Colorado, Hawaii, Kansas, Michigan, Montana, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, and Washington State have completely shifted funding for child care for employed families receiving AFDC from Title XX to AFDC's Title IV-A Child Care Disregard.

The way in which these two programs work, however, is very different. Under Title XX, the family's child care costs are paid for either through a contract or grant with a particular child care center or family day care home or through a voucher to the family. Under the Title IV-A disregard, the family must make its own child care arrangements and pay out-of-pocket for these services. The state then "disregards" these child care expenses (substracts them from the family's earned income) when calculating the amount of the family's AFDC grant. This results in the family's receiving a larger AFDC grant, or "reimbursement" for its child care costs.

Unlike Title XX, the Title IV-A Child Care Disregard is open ended. The federal government will reimburse states for at least 50 percent of their costs for AFDC benefits regardless of how high the total cost climbs.

Thus, states presumably can use AFDC to pay for at least part of the child care costs of low-income working families on AFDC and free up their limited Title XX dollars for other services. This would appear to be a creative approach to child care financing.

However, there are serious drawbacks to the Child Care Disregard that result in the program's funding an unstructured and inadequate child care system for poor families.

The reasons that the Title IV-A Disregard does not work well for families are numerous. First, families are limited to a maximum child care disregard of only $160 a month per child, regardless of the cost of care. States can set even lower maximums for part-time care. This limits families' access to quality care that may actually cost far more.

Second, child care centers that receive Title XX funding must meet minimum state or other applicable standards regarding the quality of care they provide. Under Title IV-A, families must locate their own sources of child care, which often are not required to meet similar standards for quality.

Third, through the Title IV-A Disregard, families with exceedingly low incomes are reimbursed after the fact for child care expenses. Because a family's current AFDC benefits are calculated on the family's expenses for the previous month, these benefits may not reflect increases in current child care costs.

Often, a family's day care costs are not reflected in the AFDC grant until two months later. However, welfare families cannot afford to carry this expense in the interim. And many child care programs, which are also operating on limited budget, cannot wait one or two months for the family to receive its AFDC check and pay for services provided.

Fourth, AFDC benefits in most states are intolerably low, failing to provide even a maximum level of decency. A family's out-of-pocket costs for child care must compete with other, even more basic needs, such as heat, food, and clothing. Because the $160 a month cap on child care deductions does not reflect the real cost of care—which often ranges between $2,200 and $3,200 a year for center-based programs in urban areas—a family must be willing to make up the difference if it chooses care in a child care center. Poor working families on AFDC simply cannot afford to make up this difference. Only four states, New York, Colorado, Wisconsin, and Iowa, make Title XX funds available to supplement the AFDC money a family has available for child care expenditures.

Finally, because of the method in which the Child Care Disregard is used to calculate a family's AFDC grant, these families can end up with less available income than working AFDC families who receive child care support through Title XX. The Child Care Disregard is subtracted from a family's earned income before the $30 and ⅓ disregard (which increases the size of a family's AFDC grant by disregarding $30 and ⅓ of the family's earnings before the size of the grant is calculated). Because a family's child care expenses are subtracted from its earnings first, the size of the $30 and ⅓ disregard is lowered. If, on the other hand, the family's child care costs were paid through Title XX, the family could receive a larger $30 and ⅓ disregard for working families after they have been on AFDC for four months.)

Many state officials express concern that funding child care through Title IV-A results in an inadequate catch-as-catch-can system for low-income children. "Cost of Day Care in FY '82: Savings of the Transfer to IV-A," a study by the Michigan Department of Social Services, is the sole formal analysis on the effects of the switch to funding child care with Title IV-A rather than Title XX. It reveals a decline in the use of child care centers and a corresponding increase in the use of family day care homes. The number of AFDC families using center care dropped from 21.2 percent of the total in April 1981 to 5 percent in April 1982.

The number of children who have lost child care are disquieting:

Between 8,400 and 12,000 New York state children have lost day care purchased for them by public funds between 1981 and 1983. The day care losses have directly hit the working poor. Since 1981, nine counties have totally eliminated Title XX subsidies to these families. There are now 34 counties in New York with no subsidy for non-AFDC working families.

Illinois has gone from serving 28,100 children to 18,000.

Delaware has gone from serving 2,039 children to 995.

Virginia has gone from serving 19,505 children to 15,681.

Pennsylvania has gone from serving 23,700 children to 21,786.

Nevada has gone from serving 879 children to 457.

Iowa has gone from serving 1,729 children to 1,200.

New Hampshire has gone from serving 4,000 children to 3,000.

West Virginia has gone from serving 5,200 children to 3,900.

Budget cuts fuel the development of a two tier system:

Federal, state, and local budget cuts have placed great strains on child care centers and family day care homes already receiving fragmented and inadequate support. In order to keep their doors open, some child care centers have begun to serve fewer low-income children and families. New policies have eliminated child care for these families or resulted in fees that poor families cannot pay. Centers have switched to a greater number of high income families who can pay. A state day care administrator comments: "Programs are taking fewer subsidized children and more whose parents can afford to pay privately for their care. Instead of taking ten state-funded children, they are taking two." This pattern can be seen across the country.

In January 1980, two child care centers in Black Hawk County, Iowa, served a total of 42 fee-paying children and 58 poor children subsidized under Title XX. In November 1982, the centers served 60 children whose parents paid full costs and only 43 children who received Title XX assistance.

In Wilmington, Delaware, the Salvation Army opened a center to serve the children of working poor families. Recently, it faced the prospect of closing because of dwindling enrollment. About two-thirds of its children used to be susbsidized by Title XX; now only about one-third receive subsidies.

A Grand Rapids, Michigan, day care center used to serve 55 children, all of whom received public subsidies. Now the center serves 31 children, none of whom receives a subsidy.

Children are being shifted to less supportive child care arrangments:

The results of federal, state, and local cutbacks in child care from women who are struggling to improve their family's situation through employment or training are extremely painful.

Children are being left alone or have been switched to less familiar, and often less supportive, child care arrangements.

A survey of selected families indicates that the loss of subsidy in New York state has resulted in increased numbers of children left alone. A state study of Westchester County concluded that the loss of day care increased risk of maltreatment or neglect. Some parents chose to leave work altogether and to go on welfare rather than to neglect their children. Many struggled to pay the fees of centers, often unsuccessfully. Others placed children into the care of older siblings. Still others were forced into inadequate babysitting arrangements where nutrition, stimulation, and child development were lacking. For some children, arrangements were sporadic, resulting in harmful shifting from caretaker to caretaker. It is estimated that at least one-sixth of children affected by funding cuts are regularly left unsupervised.

Low-income working families lost day care in Monroe County in 1981, 293 families earning an average of $10,000 were affected. A survey conducted to determine the effects on families and children two years after the cuts revealed that 59 families began receiving AFDC after the subsidy cuts; 33 percent of all children were currently in at least one child care arrangement which causes parents to worry; and almost one-third of the respondents reported using methods to juggle finances including not buying adequate food, clothing or medicine for the family.

In 1981, 739 West Virginia families lost child care. Some 565 of these families responded to a questionnaire regarding their current child care arrangements. A total of 391 children had experienced some type of change in child care arrangements. We need to look at this change from the viewpoint of two, three, and four year olds who are forced to leave familiar caregivers and friends. Seventy-nine children were caring for themselves.

In Pittsburgh, a combination of Pennsylvania policies—including tighter eligibility criteria and fees for services—resulting in over 200 children losing child care services, 10 percent of the total number being served. Some parents quit work. One parent commented, "I'm forced to leave my child in the care of an unlicensed babysitter whom I don't trust as much as the licensed day care provider." Another mother says, "My children are no longer with me because I couldn't find day care. The children are with their grandparents." Many older children have been forced to stay home from school to care for preschool brothers and sisters.

Federal and state cutbacks in Title XX are damaging a patchwork child care system that was never adequate:

Even before 1981, families earning little more than poverty-level wages were not eligible for child care assistance in many states. For example, Texas limits child care subsidies to families earning 47 percent or less of the state's median income, or $11,006 for a family of four. While Iowa limits help to families earning 38 percent of their median income which is below the poverty level.

In many states, inflexible income guidelines regarding who can receive Title XX child care penalize parents who experience small wage increases. Mothers refuse promotions because even a minimal pay increase can lead to the loss of a $2,500 a year child care subsidy.

Although most families using Title XX child care are headed by single women, short-sighted state and county rules limit child care for mothers enrolled in school or training programs, denying them the opportunity to gain the skills necessary to move out of poverty. There are very few child care programs targeted to adolescent mothers. Both mothers in high school and those in training programs face losing their child care support once they finish schooling or training or worse yet, policies which do not even allow support to enable them to complete school or finish a training program.

Child care is subsidized by the low wagers of workers. Two out of three center-based caregivers earn wages below the poverty level while 87 percent of family day care providers earn below the minimum wage. Approximately 75 percent of the costs of child care are salaries.

Eligible Title XX families compete for limited slots. The few states that maintain a formal waiting list for Title XX-funded child care highlight the unmet need. Massachusetts has a waiting list of 6,000 children; Florida, 4,000; Georgia, over 5,000. And these states do not keep count of the mothers who fail to sign up on the waiting list but walk away in frustration and anger. The situation of families who wait is often desperate:

"A child care program located in a suburb outside Philadelphia serves about 382 children funded by Title XX. It's average waiting list is in excess of 100 chidren. Parents must wait well over a year to receive help. One mother on the waiting list uncomfortable with the haphazard child care arrangements she had to make, quit her job and turned to welfare. Another leaves her six and seven year old home alone after school."

An expanded private sector role in child care is vital. However, if it is not accompanied by an expanded public role, millions of lower and lower-middle income families and children will be without adequate child care support:

To date, the majority of employer-sponsored child care projects have been concentrated in industries such as hospitals, banks, and other industries which view child care as an incentive in the recruitment of workers in demand occupations. Hospitals make up almost half of the over 600 employers who provide some child care assistance to families. The remaining 300 employers offer benefits ranging from noon time seminars on parenting to a child care center at the work place. While services such as Information and Referral are key to a viable child care system, they do not offer lower-income families the dollars they need to purchase adequate child care.

When child care is provided at an on-site center, its costs can be beyond the reach of lower-income employees. Senator Hatch held a hearing this November on private sector initiatives. The two companies testifying highlighted the problem. Both First Atlanta Bank and the Zale Corporation do not offer employees a reduced rate through a sliding scale. This serves to deny lowest income employees the benefits of the on-site center.

For many firms employing low skilled workers and suffering from the effects of the recession, new benefits are the last issue to be brought to the bargaining table. In fact, employers are increasingly offering child care assistance through a salary reduction plan which is again most beneficial to higher income employees. Families must earn at least $15,000 to $18,000 to gain any benefit from such an approach while those in the highest tax brackets stand to gain the largest benefit.

Given the nature of employer involvement, it is clear that those working parents currently benefiting from these initiatives are usually not those with the greatest need. According to Dana Friedman, a well-known child care expert: "Because there is little demand for unskilled labor, employers of this population have not felt the need to spend resources to provide child care for their employees. Furthermore, 50 percent of American Workers are employed by firms with fewer than 100 workers. Small firms usually avoid experimentation unless positive outcomes can be reasonably expected."

When Kristin Anderson surveyed ten industries in New York City examining the attitude and practices of 80 city employers and five unions for the Center for Public Advocacy Research, she discovered that "on the whole, companies are cautious about proceeding and waiting to see what other companies in their field do".

She concludes that child care is not a simple problem for business to address:

"Even when a company is aware of employee difficulties, it is not always clear what it should do that is appropriate in terms of employees' needs and equity for all employees;

"As an issue, child care has to overcome many overt and covert barriers on the part of both employers and employees before it becomes an area of corporate action;

"It is not easy to separate child care problems from other employee difficulties and research has not convincingly documented a clear-cut impact on productivity or job turnover from provision of a child care benefit or service;

"Parents make the decisions about how their children are cared for, and since parents have a range of preferences and considerations, a company must provide a range of services within its program;

"A child care program must fit the corporation's own needs, financial situation and corporate personality;

"Employees' child care arrangements are tied to the existing systems that provide, regulate and subsidize child care—public and private, neighborhood and center-based—so employer actions must also be taken in consideration of these larger, societal systems."

Ms. Anderson finally states "that there is little reason to believe that employer initiatives will replace, or even significantly supplement the continuing need for publicly-subsidized child care for low-income parents in the next five years".

We agree strongly with the report's final recommendation that: "It is critical that the business community plan a role in impressing on federal, state, and city government that it is in businesses' best interest for government to continue and expand subsidized child care services. The role of business in providing child care assistance will continue to expand, but public and private complementarity is essential if New York City is to have a child care system that equitably addresses the child care needs of all working parents".

There is no easy way out of the enormous dilemma that we face both in terms of accessibility and affordability of adequate child care. However there is no doubt that lower-income families must have help in meeting their child care needs. This assistance must come from public dollars so that working families are not forced to leave their children in child care situations which not only offer them an inadequate preschool experience but worse yet are potentially harmful.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you very much for all of your testimony—testimony that I think is rather overwhelming. As we attempt to try to resolve some of the problems that you have raised with respect to the delivery of quality child care it is clear we will have to acknowledge and respect the complexity of the cases.

One of the things this committee had happily experienced is great attendance by its members, so it will be the intent of the Chair to try and enforce the 5-minute rule to the extent possible, so that everybody will get an opportunity for questions.

Dr. Zigler and Dr. Kamerman, you have brought to us the most startling and disquieting statistic, which is that roughly 45 percent of women with children under the age of 1 year are now in the work force. And also, Dr. Zigler, if I am correct you are stating that the research on the impact of care on infants is, at this point at least, inconclusive as to whether it is a good or bad experience.

Dr. Kamerman, you mentioned the increased attachment of women to the workplace, that they are staying there up to delivery of their children and returning sooner. I assume that is out of economic necessity that we are seeing that.

Ms. **KAMERMAN**. Yes, very much so. We are seeing it basically because at the present time we do not have any kind of requirement that employers, for example, permit women to take off a certain amount of time at the time of childbirth and have their jobs safe for them. Of course, we certainly do not have any kind of a policy that gives women any kind of income protection at that time.

Chairman **MILLER**. You have anticipated my question, which I would like you and Dr. Zigler and Dr. Tompkins to address. As we start to consider the impact of the increased number of women in the work force with infants, maternity leave becomes one means of providing what would otherwise be very expensive care for those children—care that apparently is also being turned down by providers because, I assume, of its expense and the limited number of infants that you can or should be allowed to take care of. Would you mind expanding on what you see as the concept of in-home care provided by the mother or spouse of that child?

Ms. **KAMERMAN**. I, and Alfred Kahn, the colleague with whom I work, have recently completed a national study in the United States of what employers provide in the way of maternity policies and leaves. We found that less than 40 percent of working women in the United States at the present time are covered with the kind of basic disability insurance protection that would give them income protection for the approximately 6 to 8 weeks that most physicians think is the minimum time that a woman needs to recover after childbirth.

In addition to that, however—and remember that means 60 percent of working women do not have such basic protection—when we look at the numbers of women, working women, who have unpaid leaves and who are given the right to take such leaves and have their jobs saved for them, we discovered that at most three-quarters of the working women are in such a situation.

There is really a very substantial group of women who cannot even take an unpaid leave and be sure that they will have their job when they get back after childbirth. Maternity—childbirth—is a very vulnerable time for women who are in the labor force and concerned with keeping their job, let alone having any kind of income protection.

Only five States in the United States have legislation that requires short-term disability insurance and that requires all employers to provide such benefits. Otherwise, in the other 45 States, it is strictly up to the largess of the employer. Certainly, where smaller employers are concerned this is something that they do not routinely provide.

There are working women who have paid sick leave or can use their vacation time to cover maternity, but in such cases a woman may be left in a situation in which she has 2 weeks or 3 weeks at the time of maternity, obviously totally inadequate even for physical convalescence.

Mr. ZIGLER. Let me make two very quick points, Congressman Miller. One is that, while there is disagreement among scholars about the outcome of infant day care, there is a consensus developing—and let me be as clear as possible—that what is really best for the child and for the mother is for them to be together for the first 6 months of the baby's life.

This does not mean that women who do not choose to spend six months with their babies should not have good infant day care. Actually, Sheila Kamerman and her collaborator Al Kahn have put out a book recently on the maternity leave that she is talking about. I do not think that is the total answer to the Nation's problem.

We need an even-handed maternity-paternity child care leave in this country, which is really the only country in the industrialized world that does not have such a leave policy. There is a distinguished panel of scholars, including Sheila Kamerman, currently working on a national plan costing out what this would cost our Nation and how it would be implemented, and that plan will be available to this committee, I would think, in completed form within about 3 months.

Chairman MILLER. Dr. Tompkins, would you want to comment?

Ms. TOMPKINS. Just to emphasize that most working women do not have a choice about what they do, and that is really the key point. Whether you choose to do it through assistance to employers so that they can be more generous in terms of leave policy or whether you do it in terms of some form of subsidy, most of the people you are talking about do not have a choice.

Chairman MILLER. Your answer suggests that if we were to reach agreement that the best experience for that child would be 6 months with the mother we absolutely have no policy that reinforces that determination. We do not have at a minimum job protection for a mother that chooses to invoke that 6-month period, with minimum job protection, and family economic pressures are working in the other direction as well.

This lack of policy seems to me to be one of the key problems you have raised for this committee this morning.

Dr. Tompkins, you said that the tax credit cost the Treasury roughly how much?

Ms. TOMPKINS. $1.5 billion.

Chairman MILLER. $1.5 billion. And what portion of title XX was being spent on child care?

Ms. TOMPKINS. Federal title XX, $2.7 billion; roughly 15 percent of that is being spent on child care. The numbers are not all that great. About $600 million in Federal and State dollars are being targeted for child care.

Chairman MILLER. All three panelists spoke about the two-tier system. Would you suggest title XX expenditures are somewhat reflective of that situation?

Ms. TOMPKINS. Yes. Much less than $1 billion in Federal funds is being spent in direct subsidy either through the child care food program or through title XX, and then there are a couple of little pots, but basically much less than $1 billion and about $1.5 billion is being spent through the tax system, mostly going to aid to middle and upper middle income families and that is reflective of the tiers, yes.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you.

Congressman Marriott.

Mr. MARRIOTT. Just to follow up on that quickly, and that is Head Start, we spend $996 million or so on it. You did not include that in your testimony. Can you tell me why?

Ms. TOMPKINS. Head Start is a very important program. It serves 3-, 4-, and 5-year-olds, only about 16 to 18 percent of those who are eligible. It is clearly an important preschool program. It does not address a lot of the other kinds of gaps that we have talked about, but surely it ought to be included. It is a very important Federal program.

It generally does not get talked about. It is one of those that fits in-between. It does not get talked about as a child care program per se. Most of Head Start is not offered on a full day basis.

Mr. ZIGLER. It should. Can I add something to that?

Mr. MARRIOTT. Yes.

Mr. ZIGLER. Head Start, what has happened with Head Start is as follows. It is an important program. Let us not mistake Head Start and day care. The Head Start quality is very high and probably not necessary for much of the child care need.

What has happened is that because of this tremendous pressure, especially among the poor, for day care services, what we have had to do has watered down the real goals of Head Start, which was to improve children's development, and instead has turned much of Head Start into child care—we are kind of bootlegging day care through the Head Start program. This is costing the Head Start thrust something, in my opinion, because, as I say, Head Start is a more expensive program than day care would have to be, I think.

Chairman MILLER. But its original goals were in terms of child development.

Mr. ZIGLER. Exactly, and now they have to take up the slack on day care also.

Mr. MARRIOTT. Thank you very much. Five minutes of questions of this panel is almost impossible. I will try to give you a couple of 2-minute questions, or how about a 10-second question and a 1½-minute answer?

Chairman MILLER. You are using up your time explaining it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARRIOTT. Well, I charged that last one to you.

Two quickies. Dr. Zigler, you talked about the supply problems of infant and toddler care and the tremendous costs in operating facilities for youngsters at those ages. Is it realistic that we can develop in this country with the cost constraints, acceptable day care facilities for children zero to three—to meet the sanitation requirements, medical requirements and tremendous job of caring for young babies?

How do we put together day care facilities for children of this age given the cost restraints?

Mr. ZIGLER. Well, I think the most cost-effective way of taking care of babies this age is to make it possible for the mother to take care of the baby herself, and that is why I continue to argue in favor of a paid maternity leave, because you are exactly right. The realistic cost of infant care is somewhere between $5,000 and $7,000 a year, and it is unrealistic to assume that many families can afford that cost of service.

Mr. **Marriott**. Especially, it seems to me, the people who need that service most, the poor, who need to work rather than staying on welfare. If the cost is prohibitive, I do not understand how we can make it work at those ages. Does anyone else on the panel have any suggestions as to how we overcome the cost barrier?

Ms. **Kamerman**. Yes. I think we have to place the cost issue in a larger context. That is, I quite agree with Dr. Zigler that when we are talking about infants under the age of 6 months we are talking about one kind of situation, but as we move toward talking about children, say, that are 2 years old, for example, we are talking about a very different kind of situation.

And in effect the same issue begins to hold true for children roughly of this age, that is, roughly 2 through 4 or 5. There are two aspects to it. One is the economic cost, but the second is that when their mothers are in the labor force they are increasing the productivity of the society generally; they are making an economic contribution.

A second issue that I think has to be addressed is that when we first started to develop public primary schools and when local school boards and communities began to think about schools, nobody applied a sharp, precise, cost-benefit test to establishing primary schools.

Increasingly, what we know about child development research is suggesting that these experiences are very important for young children and that larger and larger groups of parents who can make a choice, use them. And so one needs to begin to think about what we are doing for those children whose parents cannot afford the choice; these children, too, are our future citizens.

Mr. **Marriott**. How much time do I have left, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman **Miller**. You are now using Congressman McKernan's time.

Congressman McKernan.

Mr. **McKernan**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am fascinated by the different approaches to the best way to provide for some type of Federal funding for child care, be it tax credits or direct payments. I would like to get your opinion on some type of a sliding scale to the tax credit. You talked about perhaps doing something based on infant care—giving a larger tax credit for that.

I would like to have each of you give me your thoughts on having a greater tax credit based on income as well as parental care and also how you feel about perhaps having an upper limit on those who qualify for a tax credit for child care.

Ms. **Tompkins**. We have supported vigorously and actively expansion of the sliding scale for the tax credit that is currently being considered in the House. The administration has proposed an upper limit and, given that we liked having their support for the general idea of the tax credit and the other portions of that, we went along with the cap.

Mr. **Zigler**. I agree. I would say a couple of things. One is that the problem that you are dealing with, the problem of child care, is not a social class problem. It hits families in every socioeconomic level. The thing is, we have scarce resources in our society, in any society, how do you make the thing work?

The upper limit probably is not a bad idea, but you are going to have to be kind of lenient with your upper limit because of the costs that we have discussed. That tax law could be made into a wonderful vehicle for child care in this country by doing the two things you suggest—one, tie the cost to the family income with a sliding scale and, second, also adjust it for the age of the child, which realistically reflects different costs of child care for different ages of children.

Ms. **Kamerman**. I would concur with the sense of the panel generally. That is, I would support the concept of income-related tax credit, with a larger one for low-income families.

I would also urge consideration be given to refundability for low income families because otherwise if income is below the tax threshold it is meaningless to them.

Mr. **McKernan**. I understand that and sympathize with that view.

Let me ask you one other thing. Since I come from the State of Maine I have heard a lot about employer plans, be they in-house or contracted out. And frankly you can count on two hands the number of businesses in Maine which that is going to help. With well over 80 percent of the businesses in my State having fewer than 20 employees, I am interested in some type of joint operations that we could set up.

Have any of you looked into that type of an idea where smaller businesses could band together and come up with some kind of a program that would help employees with child care?

Mr. **Zigler**. Yes. We put models like this into place some 10 or 12 years ago when I was director of the Office of Child Development. What you do is you form a little consortium, in which a group bands together and buys a certain number of slots in an ongoing child care center so that they do not have to build their own.

They simply buy a certain number of slots and among a group of these small businesses you can buy enough slots to give stability to the funding of the day care center in question.

So there are models to do exactly what you are saying, and they work fairly well.

Mr. **McKernan**. I was just going to ask whether the tax changes in 1981 have given any greater impetus to businesses to get involved in those types of programs.

Ms. **Kamerman**. The major impetus, quite frankly, is through the salary reduction plan.

Mr. **McKernan**. The IRS just said you cannot use it.

Ms. **Kamerman**. The IRS at least raised questions about it. It is unclear what the final decision is on the part of the IRS.

By the way, I have recently been talking to some employers in the Silicon Valley area. There is one consortium there, and I know of one consortium in Texas. The problem, of course, has to do with the fact that it is still expensive, that small employers have a lot of questions as to whether they are going to get into this.

And most important, what Rachel Tompkins said earlier is that unless employers are going to give a substantial discount to their employees, by and large low wage earning employees are closed out of the system. And since most of the low wage earning employees are women, most would get into a situation where they do not qualify for those programs either.

Mr. **McKernan**. That was the point I was getting at. If there is some way to encourage small businesses to make at least some type of an effort toward the offsetting cost and then have a sliding scale or tax credit to take care of the cost of the lower income employee, if that might not be just a step in the right direction.

Chairman **Miller**. Congressman Coats.

Mr. **Coats**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Zigler, I would like to pursue a couple of lines of thought here. It has been discussed a little bit, but I would like to go into it in more detail.

You indicated in your testimony that there basically is agreement among most child care experts that child care outside the home away from the mother after the first year does not produce any lasting adverse effects on children, but you did indicate that there is a real debate going on as to whether that occurs at less than 1 year.

Then later on we start talking about 6 months, and you mentioned 6 months, and I believe Dr. Tompkins also mentioned 6 months. Are we looking at 6 months or a year?

Mr. **Zigler**. The question is about the first year of life, but those of us who are trying to do something about the problems know the realities to start something.

Mr. **Coats**. OK. I understand the realities. Mothers need to work and have to work.

Mr. **Zigler**. I am talking about the 6 months. If you are going to start somewhere, the first 6 months is where you ought to start with the child care leave, because I think a year is simply too long. No woman could be out of work for a year.

Mr. **Coats**. But let us look at the effects on the child. I realize that economic reality may lead us to conclude that 6 months is where we have to start, but what about the effects on the child? What do the experts—and you are some of the experts—what do you say about the effects on the child, about a mother away from a child over the first year of life versus, say, the first 6 months?

Is it important? Do you find in your research adverse effects of the mother's absence from the child between 6 and 12 months?

Mr. **Zigler**. That is what the argument is about. There are some reports that say there are not. The problem is we have not researched this problem nearly enough. We do not have longitudinal studies. We have got short-term studies.

My own analysis indicates that there could well be some negative effects for children who experience infant day care any time during the first year of life.

Mr. **Coats**. So you would recommend, if I could restate it—and correct me if I am wrong—you would recommend if it were economically feasible or desirable that we look at options which would allow a mother to be with that child for the first 12 months of life?

Mr. **Zigler**. Definitely, yes.

Mr. **Coats**. A second question. You indicate that it is pretty settled that after that first year care away from home, the lack of the mother's presence, does not have definite ill effects. Are there any people with substantial credentials who dissent from that view? Is there a debate going on?

Mr. **Zigler**. There is a debate going on about that period. The place where there is no debate is from about 3 years old on. The first year is the most troublesome; that year between two and three is still up for grabs.

Mr. **Coats**. So would you advise us to exercise some caution, then, before we simply rush in and say we are going to institute this program? You are saying we need more studies, more information to make sure what the effects are so that we can then devise programs to best deal with this; is that a fair statement?

Mr. **Zigler**. We would need more research. We do not have all the research in; that is certainly true. And what I would recommend is to give mothers realistic alternatives that they could really live with, and my idea of social policy is simply giving people alternatives and allowing them to make decisions about their own lives.

Mr. **Coats**. Dr. Tompkins, I think you indicated that one-fifth of the women that work are below the poverty level, but we have been operating here this morning on the assumption and the statement has been made that most or almost all women have to work.

If one-fifth are below the poverty level and four-fifths are above, how do we make that determination about "have to work", "have to provide"? What about those four-fifths? Do you have a breakdown statistically as to income brackets that they fall in and how do you define "have to work"? They have to work so they can buy a new VCR at Christmas or have to work to put food on the table? I think that is an important distinction.

Ms. **Tompkins**. Surely. Twenty percent is also a fairly substantial number of people.

Mr. **Coats**. Well, all along we have been saying most women have to work. Twenty percent is not most and I am trying to get that number. Is it 50-50, is it 60-40; where are we?

Ms. **Tompkins**. Cannot give you a number like that. OK? I mean, I can get a breakdown of where families fall out, but I think the thing you have to do is look at a family budget of $15,000 or under and look at the kinds of things you can buy.

Most of those families are not making choices about VCR's. They might not be making choices about—you know, people who are making between $10,000 to $15,000 are not making choices about food on the table probably.

Mr. **Coats**. I agree with you, but does the one-fifth fall in $15,000 and under?

Ms. **Tompkins**. No. One-fifth is $9,000 and under. I do not know what percentage is $15,000 and under. Sheila may know. I do not.

Ms. **Kamerman**. I think there is one other element you should know, and that is that 60 percent of all children born in 1983 are likely to grow up in a single parent family for some period of time before they are 18, which means that where most women are concerned, to begin with, the economic pressures are either very, very high because they are single mothers or the risk of being in that situation is very high. In effect, work becomes a kind of insurance against the loss of child support.

Mr. **Coats**. I could not agree with you more on that.

Chairman **Miller**. Just wanted to get that statement and cut it off.

Mr. **Coats**. It was a dynamite followup.

Chairman **Miller**. Congressman Wolf.

Mr. **Wolf**. I have no questions at this time.

Chairman **Miller**. Congressman Fish?

Mr. **Fish**. Dr. Tompkins, you did a good job of summarizing the statement of 19 pages and I was not able to read the whole thing. I just wondered in your analysis of what has gone wrong with title XX and title IX and the disregard, could you tell us just in a couple of minutes what you would like to see this Congress do if you had your druthers?

Ms. **Tompkins**. Well, if I had my druthers this year, Congressman Fish, I believe that Congress should expand title XX so that there is more direct funding out there in the system for child care. There simply are not enough dollars for low-income families.

And using the disregard is a creative way to deal with the problem that States have of trying to spread not enough money over a lot of needs—children's needs, adults' needs, senior citizen needs—and they are struggling to try to spread title XX across too many needs. So more money in title XX is at the top of our list.

I think the second thing that would be extremely useful is to move on the dependent care tax credit and expanding the sliding scale and moving on refundability.

Third, if you are going to do one other thing this year that does not cost a whole lot of money but is real important in terms of the needs out there would be to take a look at the after-school measure that Representative Schroeder and others have put forward—some kind of assistance.

There is a wonderful sort of stewmaking going on out there at the local community level of school systems and community groups and others of getting together to try to piece together the kind of care system that is needed, but it needs a little help.

Mr. **Fish**. Thank you.

Now, Dr. Kamerman, you expressed agreement as to refundability of the tax credit. If we are talking about programs that do not reach the working poor, which I think is the bottom line here, you would have to have this refundability every month, would you not, to make any difference?

Ms. **Kamerman**. Yes.

Mr. **Fish**. So why have it in the first place?

Ms. **Kamerman**. Why have it in the first place? Because it is a way of adding to cash flow as well as income as far as parents are concerned. On the other hand, if one is talking about responding to the needs of low-income parents, I would support more strongly an expansion of title XX.

Mr. **Fish**. But you think there is a place for both because there are people that are not working poor that are just a little above that who could benefit from the refundable tax credit?

Ms. **Kamerman**. The critical issue for low-income working poor is that in a number of States the income eligibility level for title XX subsidized services is so low that even if they earn at the level of the minimum wage they may not qualify for such services since several States have no provision for income-related fees, that becomes a critical issue.

Mr. **Fish**. Dr. Zigler, I guess it was Dr. Tompkins who just mentioned the after-school measure, but you hit this specifically in your testimony on page five—the relatively inexpensive solution of a parent-school partnership.

I am delighted to see this in your statement because I thought I had invented it until I found in my district that it was quite a well-developed matter, particularly in the elementary schools. One school district, I recall, had four elementary schools and three of them at noon bused the youngsters who needed this help to the fourth one, which stayed open until 6 without any undue burden.

They were in the classroom all day and they waited until their parents came to pick them up any time up to 6. The committee members have heard me probably boring them with bringing this up in various hearings, but I found, Mr. Chairman, that the schools were open, that there were young boys on the basketball courts, that there was a teacher next door cleaning up her classroom.

She had four classes and it looked like Silly Putty all over the place—all over the floor, all over the wall—and here it was 4 in the afternoon and she still had to clean it up for tomorrow.

So I mean it is not as if the building had to be kept open for this purpose. Care was in familiar surroundings and, as I recall, it was a cooperative agreement with a local day care council, which is a variation on what you said, though I think you said a child development associate.

I take it this is the kind of thing that the panel would like to foster for this group. How do we go about it?

Mr. **Zigler**. We are all in agreement that the target of highest opportunity is the school-age child between about 6 and 11. The models that you are reporting to us, Congressman Fish, are excellent models. They are all over the country now.

What we have to do is acquaint local people with these models, and I recommend for your perusal the program that was recently launched by Health and Human Services. It is simply much too small. The Government role probably ought to be limited to bringing local people together at conferences around the country, transmitting to them the models of good programs, and also letting them know which programs fall on their face—there are few of those.

And if the Government would just give that much and a little bit of seed money, which is what the Reagan people are now doing, if that program were expanded and we really had somebody in charge.

One of the problems is that for this tremendous problem that we are all here talking about, that you are going to be working on for a year or so, it is very hard to find anybody in the executive branch who says, "Hey, this is my problem. Here is this No. 1 problem of American life." So somebody has to put some heat on the people and build up the capabilities of the executive branch to deal with the problem we are here discussing.

And what is needed is a little leadership, a little bit of money, a little bit of imagination, and much more could be done, especially for children in this age range.

Mr. **Fish**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman **Miller**. Thank you.

Congressman Wolf.

Mr. **Wolf**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will try not to cover areas already discussed.

Dr. Zigler, you seem to be making the point with Mr. Coats about the 6 months and 1 year period. Given the fact that you seem to personally believe that the mother should be with the child the first 6 months, and I could even say further that you strongly believe up to 1 year, I would like to know what you think about the idea of increasing the standard deduction all the time or certainly during that period of time the mother isn't working in order to encourage the parent to stay home, if it is at all possible?

Mr. **Zigler**. Speaking to you as a psychologist and developmentalist, anything that makes it possible for a mother to take care of her own child during that first year of life I would be in favor of.

Mr. **Wolf**. So you would favor that?

Mr. **Zigler**. Yes.

Mr. **Wolf**. The second question you talked about concerns time in maternity leave. What do you think is a fair length of time to ask a company to give for maternity leave? You know, we give teachers and professors a sabbatical every 7 years. Is it not fair to say 9 months or 1 year? What do you think would be a fair time period?

Mr. **Zigler**. Well, we are working on this now and will have a report, as I say, shortly. I think that we could probably—we have looked at other countries and Dr. Kamerman is an expert in what is going on in other countries. Six months might probably be the place to start, and our first cost analysis shows that this does not turn out to be terribly expensive.

Remember now, women now work, given what Dr. Kamerman said, something on the average of 40 years, and we now know that the average woman is going to have two children, so we are talking about 1 year out of a 40-year work career, which is not all that much time or that much money. So it is doable.

Mr. **Wolf**. So it might not only be 6 months, but it might be a year for each child, because like in a sabbatical—how is it now in the university where you work? Do you get a sabbatical every 7 years?

Mr. **Zigler**. Every 7 years, regular as clockwork.

Mr. **Wolf**. So if we are going to be fair, we ought to argue leave should be given for the birth of every child. Say if an average woman has two children, she would take maternity leave a year for each child.

During that period of time, how much of a salary do you think she should receive? Should she be paid full, three-quarters, or half salary?

Mr. **Zigler**. Seventy-five to 80 percent would be the number.

Mr. **Wolf**. What do you think, Doctor?

Ms. **Kamerman**. Well, I can tell you what the prevailing pattern is in most European countries. It is to have a paid maternity leave that covers most of the salary of women up to whatever the wage is that is covered under social insurance. However, the other possibility is to use a pattern that is similar to that used under short-term disability insurance programs, which, depending upon the benefit, replaces somewhere between 50 or 60 percent to 70 or 75 percent of wages, up to a maximum.

Mr. WOLF. My last question is, What do you think about programs such as flexi-time whereby the parents can leave and come back at a different time or the husband can leave home earlier, the wife can stay later? Also, what do you think about shared jobs where two women share one job? Lastly, with the use of the home computer, what do you think about the opportunity to work at home?

Do you have any comments about these alternatives?

Ms. KAMERMAN. If I may, I think anything that makes it easier for adults to cope with both work and family life and child-rearing is great, and the extent to which it is going to be helpful is going to vary depending on the individual situation and on the situation of the employee, obviously.

However, there are limitations as to how effective that can be since flexi-time still has constraints. There are a lot of women who would like to be able to work part time and think that this would be preferable as long as they have full fringe benefits. However, there are also a lot of women who now work part time and who are trying desperately to get full-time jobs and cannot get them.

So I would urge that we continue support for the concept of options without specifying any particular one.

If I could, could I add one other thing with regard to increasing the standard deduction? I would point out that that approach would benefit more affluent families. It would not benefit families——

Mr. WOLF. I understand, but we can consider it if it will benefit anybody—we are talking about options and approaches today. We are not talking about one solid thing that is going to solve the problems of our parents. So if it is going to help that 30 percent or that 40 percent, it is one of the options we should consider? Then for those who are under that provision we could consider a tax credit or payment or something like that, so I do not think we could criticize. It is just an option for day care service.

Ms. KAMERMAN. I only meant that one could consider substituting a tax credit for the standard deduction.

Mr. WOLF. I would hope that we would spend more time looking in——

Chairman MILLER. You can finish the sentence.

Mr. WOLF. That we can spend more time looking at the private sector because I think the answers and the money are in the private sector and not necessarily in the public sector.

Thank you very much.

Chairman MILLER. Congressman Weiss.

Mr. WEISS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I have no questions.

Chairman MILLER. We have 5 minutes left.

I want to thank you very much on behalf of the committee. I think you have in a very short period of time raised many issues that we must address. I think we have got to recognize the different situations that families find themselves in at different times and provide those kinds of flexible care alternatives that would readily address those families.

I am very happy with the questioning by the members which suggests agreement that there must be a number of options available to families. Most importantly, I think you have given us very difficult and challenging testimony, testimony that raises the issues of the increased number of children in need, the reduced slots, and the difficulty in fashioning adequate responses.

Since you have given us such an enormous workload, you must now continue to work with us as we try to hammer out recommendations to take to Congress for the next legislative year. I would hope that you would consider doing that with us.

Thank you very much again for your time and your testimony and the thought that you have put into it.

The next panel the committee will hear from will be comprised of Joan Rhones and her daughter Carletha Rhones, and I believe Carletha's brother Aaron is also here, to accompany his sister to the table; Margaret Bai Clay, who is a parent and president of the Virginia Family Day Care Association; Rebecca Henson, who is a parent from Fairfax County, VA; and James Carver Githens, who is age 11, from Baltimore, MD.

If you will come up and take a chair at the committee table. You have been waiting a long time to testify, but I do not want any of you to be nervous.

Welcome to the committee. We look forward to your testimony and your written statements will be placed in the record in their entirety, so please proceed in the manner in which you are most comfortable. Again, I want to tell you to be relaxed. We are interested in what you have to say and will follow it up at the completion of the panel with some questions from the Members of Congress.

So first, Joan, would you like to start out? If you could, pull the microphone over to you so we can all hear what you have to say. I failed to mention that Joan Rhones is a parent from Washington, DC.

STATEMENT OF JOAN RHONES, PARENT, WASHINGTON, DC

Ms. Rhones. Today I come before you as a mother who continually thanks God for day care and those persons who are day care advocates. As a working mother of four children I know the values of day care.

My children since infancy have experienced child abuse and child neglect. They have had multiple babysitters. In fact, the baby who just recently turned 7 years old has had a total of nine babysitters before being day care age. When I was no longer income-eligible I tried the parent watch approach, but that did not work because there were repeated break-in attempts and finally a break-in which made me realize that this was no longer an alternative that was safe for me or the children.

As a result of this, I refused my next raise and promotion—it was not the first time—but after the children got to the age I thought they would be safe enough that they could come home from school and stay there until I could come home and continue to progress on my job.

It was hard to find and is still hard to find an affordable babysitter that I can afford on my salary. I found the National Child Day Care Association has provided my children with the quality care that they need. It has given my children a positive male image and, most of all, a positive attitude about themselves.

It has helped me by serving as an ongoing link for drug and alcohol abuse prevention and crime prevention. It has been that filler that has made my children talk about their frightening experiences, thereby relieving them of the mental stress that they have suffered throughout their young lifetimes.

I truly believe that they are better children as a result of day care. I sincerely urge you to strongly support and actively develop a better day care system in this Nation. Day care is that support network that removes the children from working parents' incarceration. It is that support system that channels idle time into a positive direction. It removes children from limitless hours of television and provides them with a sense of high esteem.

I suggest that in developing a better day care system nationally that you would consider the following. One, day care should be available for all working parents. This should not be dependent on anything. The ulterior concern should be for the children and their welfare.

More males should be encouraged to seek employment as day care staff personnel. With the high increase in single parent homes, with the head of the household normally being a female, children need to be exposed to a positive male image role model on a daily basis.

Infancy day care slots should be increased. Sliding fee scale income should be generated not only on the number of persons in a household but also on the bills that are necessary to maintain a household, and this includes consideration for food, clothing, health, and life insurance and the like.

Once a child has been declared eligible for day care services, that child should remain eligible until the end of elementary school.

More money should be allocated to day care providers. The money should be used for salary increases for day care staff. This in turn would raise the low morale that currently exists. This would attract persons who would normally seek other jobs because of day care's miniscule starting salaries. It would also raise the low morale of the existing staff. Some of the moneys should also be used to develop and maintain better facilities for day care.

More public facilities—schools, recreation and the like—should be used to provide space for day care providers whether they are private providers or community agencies.

Businesses should be strongly urged to provide space for day care facilities and actively work with the parents in developing such. Parent involvement should be mandatory. I found this to be true because where there was a slip in the quality of care as a parent that was concerned—the staff never knew when you were coming in or when you would ask questions, and they were always providing quality care just to be on guard. So parent involvement is an important part.

I urge you to realize that an investment in day care returns more than 300 percent in dividends. More taxes are and will be generated because more parents will be working. Better children, citizens, are being produced because of the support system that exists. Drug and alcohol prevention is being emphasized.

A mechanism can also be developed to deduct from income tax returns of any parent using day care services to offset the cost of Government spending.

I thank you for listening to me today and for giving me this time. I do hope I have adequately conveyed some of the misfortunes that not only my children have experienced but others as well. Help us to protect our children and to remove the gambling of child care from our lives and their lives.

[Prepared statement of Joan Rhones follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOAN RHONES

Today, I come before you as a mother, who continuously thanks God for day care and those persons who are day care advocates. As a working mother of four children, I know the values of day care.

My children, since infancy, have been the victims of child abuse and neglect. They have experienced multiple babysitters in their short life spans. When I was no longer income eligible, I tried the parent watch approach, but after repeated attempted break-ins and finally a break-in while the children were home alone, I decided again to refuse a raise and promotions. This was done so that I would become income eligible for day care services.

It's hard to find an affordable, qualified babysitter on my salary. National Child Day Care Association has provided my children with the quality care that's needed for them. It has given my children a positive male image and most of all a positive attitude about themselves. It has helped me by serving as an on-going link for drug and alcohol abuse prevention and crime prevention. It has been that filler that has made my children talk about their frightening experiences, thereby relieving them of their stress. I truly believe that they are better children as a result of day care.

I sincerely urge you to strongly support and actively develop a better day care system in this nation. Day care is that support network that removes the children from working parent(s) incarceration. It's that support system that channels idle time into a positive direction. It removes children from limitless hours of television and provides them with a sense of high esteem.

I suggest that in developing a better day care system nationally that you would consider the following:

1. Day care should be available for all working parents. This should not be dependent on anything. The ulterior concern should be for children and their welfare.
2. More males should be encouraged to seek employment as day care staff personnel. With the high increase in single parent homes, with the head of the household normally being a female, children need to be exposed to a positive male image role model on a daily basis.
3. Infancy day care slots should be increased.
4. Sliding fee scale income should be generated not only on the number of persons in the household, but also in the bills that are necessary to maintain a household. (This includes consideration for food, clothing, health and life insurance.
5. Once a child has been declared eligible for day care services that child should remain eligible until the end of elementary school.
6. More money should be allotted to day care providers. The money should be used for salary increases for day care staff. This would attract persons who are normally seeking other jobs because of day care's miniscule starting salary. It would also raise the low morale of the existing staff. Some of the monies should also be used to develop and maintain better facilities for day care.
7. More public facilities (schools, recreation and the like) should be used to provide space for day care providers whether they are private providers or community agencies.
8. Businesses should be strongly urged to provide space for day care facilities and actively work with the parents in developing such.
9. Parent involvement should be mandatory.

I urge you to realize that an investment in day care returns more than three hundred percent in dividends.

1. More taxes are/will be generated because more parents will be working.
2. Better children (citizens) are being produced because of the support system that exists.
3. Drug and alcohol prevention is being emphasized.
4. A mechanism can be developed to deduct from income tax returns of any parent using day care services to offset the cost of government spending.

I thank you for listening to me today and for giving me this time. I do hope I have adequately conveyed some of the misfortunes that not only my children have experienced, but others as well. Help us to protect our children and to remove the gambling of child care from our lives with their (children's) lives.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you.

Carletha, are you ready to read your statement? You need the microphone over in front of you.

STATEMENT OF CARLETHA RHONES

Ms. RHONES. My brother and sister and I were at home most of the time by ourselves after school had let out. My father was supposed to be watching us when we went home. If my father was not there he would leave us a note and we did what it told us to do.

Some of the things the note would tell us to do would be to make up our beds, lock the door, stay in one room, don't answer the door if it wasn't my parents and et cetera.

There were times that we did things wrong. For example: one, playing with fire; two, sneaking out to play—that is because we never had time to play except when we were at school; three, playing with knives; four, fighting; five, playing with the chemistry set without my mother's help; six, and a whole lot of other things.

There were times we would eat late because we would have to wait for my mother to come home. It was scary because there we were all alone, just waiting. We tried to be good children because we knew that's what my mother wanted us to be, but that was kind of hard to do. It looked like we were always thinking of something wrong to do.

One summer my mother's friend told her about day care and she went to go check it out. We were so happy that we didn't have to stay at home by ourselves any more. Then we went to day care.

We do a lot of things in day care to keep us from getting in trouble. My mother calls it supervised, structured time. We have activities in day care such as an educational period, arts and crafts, trips, sports, dancing lessons, and et cetera. Day care is fun to go to instead of going home. Now that we are not at home, we have a lot of fun at day care.

At 5:00 we eat dinner. After dinner we wait for our mother to come and pick us up. While we are waiting we play a while, then we do arts and crafts, and usually we draw pictures or make something for our mother.

The staff is great and very friendly. Sometimes we have birthday parties, going-away parties and regular parties. Because we are in day care, we have been able to participate in other programs. We run track for the Anacostia Youth Athletic Club, and Aaron and I are in HAP. HAP is a Higher Achievement Program for students above grade level. They help you keep ahead of your grades by making you stronger in the basic subjects.

My grades and behavior have changed a lot since I have started day care. I don't have to worry any more about somebody else breaking in our house while we are waiting for our mother. There are a lot of other things I could tell you that have frightened me when we were home by ourselves, but I think they are very personal and should be kept in the family.

Chairman **Miller**. Thank you very much, Carletha. Aaron?

STATEMENT OF AARON RHONES

Master **Rhones**. When children like us at home they would sometimes play with fire or even try to cook, and with nobody there to take care of them they would do things like throw knives at each other like you see in the circus and mess up the house. We would sometimes take the knives we played with and cut up the plants.

My mother would not let us have firecrackers. But if our friends in school shared them with us we would take a soda bottle and light the firecracker and put it in the soda bottle and throw it. On a rainy day we would have a flood in our house and nobody was there to help us try not to let it run. It would just run.

We would sometimes sneak out and forget to take the key with us. And we would be locked out of our house for a long time until my mother came home. I remember when people would try to break in into our house and many more bad things.

Now while we are in day care we do not have problems like those any more. In day care we like to do arts and crafts, go outside to play with the other children, learn about fire prevention and drug prevention and other things. When we are through playing, we wash our hands and line up to go up the hall and eat. We do not have to worry about leaving the keys any more, and I am saying that day care helps a lot.

Because we do not have to go home, Carletha and I go to HAP. HAP is a Higher Achievement Program. It is for smart kids in many schools. It is like school, but you only have three subjects, such as vocabulary, math, and reading. It helps us too by explaining the things we do not understand and many more things. Also, because of day care we can do a lot of other things besides sitting in our room until our mother comes home.

Thank you.

Chairman **Miller**. Thank you, Aaron.

Margaret?

STATEMENT OF MARGARET BAI CLAY, PARENT AND PRESIDENT OF THE VIRGINIA FAMILY DAY CARE ASSOCIATION

Ms. **Bai Clay**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for inviting me to speak here. In 1979 I began to do day care when we moved, when my family and I moved from New York. We had three children, two of which were from a previous marriage and I was not receiving child support.

When we moved here from New York my husband was at that time preparing for law school. We were both unemployed at the time. Sitting down together and discussing the possibility of my going out to work, it was a disaster. The cost of my finding child care for each of our three children—the youngest being 3 weeks old at that time—was financially out of the question. It meant that I would have to find care for them at different night hours, maybe not with the same provider, day care centers. I might have had to utilize many forms of day care.

The only answer was to stay at home and take care of my family and be a day care provider. In the fall of 1980, shortly after we moved to Springfield, VA, I became ill and needed bed rest. Let me go on record saying that this was not due to the nature of my family day care work. It was not a breakdown of any kind; it was mononucleosis.

But because I had four day care children to take care of I really felt a deep responsibility to them and their parents and to my own family financially. I did not follow doctor's orders and go to bed to recuperate. I became worse and finally I had to advertise in the community newspaper to find someone who like myself was providing day care services in our community. She agreed to help me out until I became able to work again.

Once back on my feet I made it my crusade to seek out other women like myself who provided home day care and who like myself felt alienated from the rest of the world. I wrote articles for a community newspaper asking if there were others who felt this way. I went to local supermarkets and put up signs on bulletin boards and tore off phone numbers of other babysitters advertising.

I spent many hours on the telephone calling these women, telling them of what I thought we could do for one another in forming a network or support group. Finally we started, five women and one man, in a living room. We talked of our feelings about the work we did, the problems. We wrote and rewrote contracts. We grew in numbers and are continuing to grow.

The Family Day Care Associations have been forming all around the United States. They start small, maybe 15 or 20, and grow perhaps to statewide organizations with membership of 2,000. It is evident by their numbers that these providers are reaching out to one another in hope of support. They are seeking it and they are seeking to provide it.

In the past, unlike the teacher or bank teller or secretary with office mates to talk over the problems of the day, the family day care provider has no such person. She was alone and isolated and did not get the needed emotional support she desired.

Often the spouse of the provider did not understand or appreciate the awesome responsibility of caring for someone else's children 40 to 60 hours a week, a very long working day starting sometimes at 5:45 a.m., and not ending until 6:30 or 7:00 p.m. at night, of cleaning the carpet after a sick child, of not having much adult conversation or adult companionship during the day, of 4 or 5 rainy days in a row, and the plants have just been eaten up by the dog or the kids have just learned how to push just the right button to start World War III in my very own living room.

Only another provider who has experienced this knows what this is like. In 1981, I had heard about the Office for Children. I was definitely at the right place at the right time. I enrolled in their Fairfax County training class. This is not a licensing procedure. It is not mandatory. It is voluntary on the part of the providers.

The Fairfax County Office of Children training class provides 40 hours of family day care training, 12 of which are first aid, two mornings a week. They provide free day care for the children of the person in attendance and the class itself is free.

What I heard from the person who did the training class I thought I might have heard before and I did. But I had heard it from a different perspective and I really learned what it was like to see the world from 2½ feet off the ground. I began to think first of how my day care children might react or feel in a given situation. I learned how to approach family day care in a more professional manner, from how and what kind of records to keep for income tax purposes to the social, emotional and physical growth of the child to how to deal with day care parents and again, of course, the first aid.

In addition, I received four credits of continuing education. I met many dedicated women in the training class, women of all ages, of all economic backgrounds and classes, women of all ethnic origins and, most importantly, how we had a common bond. We were women who wanted to care for children and we were there in this training class because we wanted to improve ourselves and the quality of care we provided.

This training class was one means of attaining our goal. Another means was by participating in the child care food program which, as you may know already, is the reimbursement program designed by the Department of Agriculture and administered by the Fairfax Office for Children. There is more to this food program than meets the eye. It is an educational tool which providers have to learn more about good nutrition, how to provide it for day care children.

This information is not for providers alone. It filters down to day care children and to the parents. It was through this program that many of the day care children learn that one of the administrations considered ketchup as a vegetable to be reimbursed for. This diet is supported by the Federal Government, and we thank you, Mr. Miller, for your continued support in this.

Locating family day care can often be a problem for parents. They may not be as fortunate as I to live in a county such as Fairfax that has a well-organized information and referral computer system. It is often by word of mouth or the grapevine.

Ideally, parents would like to have immediate relatives care for their child—aunt or sister or grandma—but in these days grandma herself is holding down a full-time job or may be 500 miles away. So family day care is usually and naturally the next choice.

The reasons parents opt for family day care are many. They can be summed up in the following:

Evironment: Many parents feel a tremendous amount of guilt having to entrust their child to a nonrelative. In order to assure themselves that the child is going to be reared in a loving family atmosphere as opposed to a larger day care setting many parents seek to place their children in homes which are similar to their own so that the importance of value-instilling and attitude formation can be continued even in the absence of the parent.

Affordability: Unlike day care centers whose rates are fairly standard, family day care costs vary greatly according to the economy of the area in which the parent lives and is seeking day care.

Rates per child per week range from low as $25 to $100 in more affluent neighborhoods.

Flexibility: Day care centers often do not open until 7 and the parent needs to leave for work at 6:30. They often do not get home until 6:30 or 7 at night. Many parents whose lives do not fit easily into schoolhouse schedules appreciate the flexibility that family day care offers. Although the possibility for exploitation of the provider does exist, family day care, properly managed, can offer parents freedom to exist as people rather than deadline-directed automatons. In today's pressurized society this may be one of the most important considerations of all.

And last, but not least, the range of services the family day care providers can give which might otherwise be unaffordable and prohibitive. Infant care is one of the areas where child care is seriously lacking. Statistics already show that there is a baby boom now going on. Because State and local authorities wisely impose limits on the number of infants one can safely and sanely handle, a provider is restricted to the number of infants she can care for.

There are just not enough infant care centers, and if a mother needs to return to work 6 weeks after the birth of her infant, family day care may be her only choice. This brings to mind a woman in our community who was married. She is in the Navy. She has a 5-month-old child. One month before her child was born she began seeking day care for this child. Both she and her husband have rotating shifts. This child has been to four or five different providers and she never knows which one at the time is going to be taking care of her.

So the area of people—nurses, firemen, policemen—on rotating shifts that need day care needs also to be addressed.

Chairman MILLER. Excuse me. The husband and wife were both in the Navy?

Ms. BAI CLAY. I believe so, yes. I know the woman is. She is on a rotating schedule. I talked to her late last night and she has still not found a regular provider. She needs care from 11 at night until 7 in the morning, sometimes 3 in the afternoon until 11 at night. It is very difficult for her.

Chairman MILLER. The U.S. Navy does not provide it.

Ms. BAI CLAY. Exactly.

Family day care providers can reasonably provide low-priced day care for infants and handicapped children, thereby freeing still another segment of the parent population for outside home employment. They can cater to special diets, provide special attention to children during an emotional crisis, and identify incipient physical and psychological problems which might go unnoticed in a larger institutional setting.

In my county, Fairfax County, the social services department has started a program called Project Bonnet. The social service department has recognized the value of family day care providers by using them and calling them into service to care for children of stressed families, children that have suffered child abuse and neglect. They are removing the children from the home portions of the day and putting them in family day care homes. They are working with the parent, the provider and the child.

Family day care homes can be enormously valuable means of safeguarding our school aged children. They can successfully limit the number of latchkey children who may fall prey to drugs, vandalism or unsavory characters of our society who try to corrupt these young minds. School age care programs operated by many neighborhood schools are already filled to the max and have waiting lists that go on and on. Family day care can and must be called into service and utilized more extensively.

The chief problems of the family day care provider, at least those which can be alleviated in some part by the Federal Government, can be summarized under these headings.

Financial: The major financial support which the Federal Government offers to the family day care provider is in the form of favorable tax benefits under section 280(A) of the Internal Revenue Code and by implication through the child care tax credit which is available to working parents with children in day care.

We heartily endorse the proposals now in Congress which would increase further the amount of tax credit available to parents who because of employment reasons must leave their children in day care.

The child care food program sponsored by the Department of Agriculture has also been of great assistance to family day care providers through day care parents and their children.

Requirements of local governments. There are parts of the country where the family day care provider is virtually being pushed out of business because of the stringent licensing requirements, coupled with special use permit fees and applications which have been imposed by Federal and local governments.

Down in Prince William County in Virginia for family day care providers there is a law on the books that states they must apply and pay for a $1,500 or $1,600 special use permit. If the family day care provider had $1,500 for this purpose, she would not be doing what she is doing, and this is a per year; it is not a one-time application. You pay $1,500 per year.

Now I understand that some of these rules and regulations that are on the books conflict, and it may be because local governments do not know already what the State governments have already got on the books as far as regulations.

Family day care, the care given by a provider, typically a female of various ages, ethnic origins, diverse education and economic backgrounds, varying levels of skills, who may be teachers, nurses, secretaries, grocery store clerks or government employees caring for children in their own home, is facing change and challenge.

By urging State and local governments to review existing zoning and licensing regulations that may impede the growth of family day care, the Federal Government can play a large role in ensuring that the family day care system as it is evolving in America today is preserved and protected. The Federal Government, by openly acknowledging the valuable service that providers offer to their community, can afford family day care the long overdue respect it has so rightly earned and enhance the family day care public image.

Family day care providers contribute mightily to the economic welfare of our country by caring for its children. The Federal Government can encourage State and local governments to develop more stable methods of registration or licensing or certifying family day care homes that is neither inhibiting, excessively restrictive, or threatening to family day care providers or to those people contemplating it as a profession.

These methods of registration should be simple while still maintaining minimum standards, enforceable and, above all, an incentive to family day care providers to be more visible in the community. It is she who has contributed to the child's values. It is she who partakes in teaching the important skills of social interaction, and it is she who largely is responsible for the formation of attitudes of those who will be tomorrow's adults.

It is imperative that the Federal Government recognize the importance of family day care providers by continuing to provide support for this important activity. The last word on family day care providers is that they do hold America's future in their hands.

[Prepared statement of Margaret Bai Clay follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MARGARET BAI CLAY, PRESIDENT OF THE VIRGINIA FAMILY DAY CARE ASSOCIATION, FAIRFAX COUNTY, VA

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I want to thank you for inviting me to address you this morning. My name is Margaret Bai Clay and I am the President of the Virginia Family Day Care Association, an organization consisting of several hundred self-employed family day care providers, most of them in Northern Virginia. I would like to review with you some of the problems and potential of family day care in 1984 and to suggest some ways in which the Federal Government can make a significant contribution to this area of endeavor.

Family day care, as the name suggests, is the care of children in a family setting by a provider who is unrelated to one or more of the youngsters. Some estimates indicate that 80% of the children who are cared for by persons other than their parents are in family day care homes. The life of a provider is often not an easy one. Fringe benefits are migraines; vacations are defined as days when a parent does not question the jelly stain on Susie's blouse; "moving up the ladder" is bringing the vacuum cleaner to the second floor after finishing the first. Yet there are definite rewards to the occupation: The provider earns a living, contributes mightily to the support of his or her own family, and has a sense of self sufficiency and financial independence which might be otherwise unavailable to her. Moreover, the family day care provider plays an increasingly important role in today's society since economic conditions almost dictate that many families have both spouses employed outside the home, thus, creating a greater need for quality child care.

Why do parents opt for family care?

The reasons are myriad, but can be conveniently summarized under the following headings:

1. *Environment.*—Many parents feel a great deal of guilt upon being forced to entrust their child to another for large portions of the day. In order to ensure themselves that the child is being reared in a loving family atmosphere as opposed to an institutional environment, many parents seek to place their children in homes which are similar to their own so that the important tasks of value instilling and attitude formation can continue even in the absence of the parent.

2. *Affordability.*—Unlike day care centers, whose rates are fairly standard, family day care costs vary greatly according to the economy of the area in which the home is located. Rates per child per week range from $25 in low income areas to $100 or more in affluent neighborhoods. This is quite important. Often the second wage earner in the family is paid at a very low rate and his/her (usually her) ability to go out to work depends on the availability of child care whose cost is proportionate to her income. The importance of this for the national economy is too obvious to belabor.

3. *Flexibility.*—"Be here by 6:00 p.m. or we have a mechanic's lien on your first born" reads the preschool contract. Many parents, whose lives do not fit neatly into schoolhouse schedules, appreciate the flexibility that family day care offers. Although the possibility for exploitation of the provider exists, family day care, properly managed, can offer parents freedom to exist as people rather than deadline di-

rected automata. In today's pressurized society this may be one of the most important considerations of all.

4. *Range of services.*—Family day care providers can offer services which are otherwise unavailable or cost prohibitive. They can provide reasonably priced care for infant and handicapped children, thereby freeing still another segment of the parent population of outside-the-home employment. They can cater to special diets, provide special attention to children during emotional crises, and identify incipient physical and psychological problems which might go unnoticed in a larger institutional setting. Finally, family day care providers can offer part-time care for school age children. This helps to combat the problem of "latch key children," whose numbers have been growing at an alarming rate and have been providing an unfortunately golden opportunity for those in our society who find their prey in unprotected children.

What are the problems of the family day care provider, and how can the federal government help?

The chief problems of the family day care provider, at least those which can be alleviated by the federal government, can be summarized under three headings.

1. *Financial.*—The major financial support which the federal government offers to the family day care provider is in the form of favorable tax benefits under § 280A of the Internal Revenue Code, and by implication, through the child care tax credit which is available for working parents with children in day care. We heartily endorse those proposals now in the Congress which would increase further the amount of tax credit available to parents who because of employment reasons must leave their children in day care.

The Child Care Food Program, sponsored by the Department of Agriculture, has also been of great assistance to family day care providers. Through these monthly reimbursements for meals which conform to departmental standards, the provider is able to furnish a higher quality diet to the children in her care and is able to eliminate some less appealing items, e.g. excessive sugars and starches, which might be necessary absent the federal assistance. However, recent cuts in Title XX have made this Child Care Food Program somewhat less of a help than it used to be. We encourage the Congress to restore the food program benefits to previous levels, and we certainly deplore any effort to further reduce the amount of money available for this critical program.

2. *Requirements of local governments.*—There are parts of the country where the family day care provider is virtually being pushed out of business because of stringent licensing requirements coupled with sizable licensing fees which have been imposed by local governments. Because of the rapid growth in family day care, it is natural that county and state governments will look to the provider as an additional source of revenue and impose new and sometimes prohibitive taxes. Given the overall importance of the family day care provider in an economy which is to a large extent based on the two-earner family, we encourage the Congress to utilize the power of the purse strings to be sure that local governments which receive federal assistance are not allowed to impose unnecessarily stringent requirements on family day care providers.

3. *The problem of public image.*—To many members of the public, the family day care provider is nothing more than a babysitter. This is not the case at all. By definition a babysitter is one who sits with the child. A family day care provider is a person who provides a substitute for the child's family when that family is not available to tend to the physical and emotional needs of the child. In a very real sense, the future of America is in the family day care provider's hands. It is she who instills values; it is she who teaches the important skills of social interaction; and it is she who is responsible for the formation of attitudes in those who will be tomorrow's adults. It is imperative that the federal government recognize the importance of the family day care provider by continuing to provide support for this important activity. The last word on the family day care provider is that America's future is indeed in her hands. Let's give her a hand.

Chairman **MILLER**. Thank you very much.

James, we are going to ask you to read your testimony at this time.

STATEMENT OF JAMES CARVER GITHENS

Master **GITHENS**. My name is James Carver Githens. I'm in sixth grade at Falstaff Middle School in Baltimore City. I am the only child in my family. I am brought home at about 3 p.m. by the yellow bus. I have been coming home for 3 years to an empty home. In the second and third grades I went to a day care program.

When I get home I have to walk my dog and do my homework. Usually my mother gets home around 5 p.m. She works at my school, so if I have to stay after school for some reason I can wait there until she comes to pick me up. About 2 days out of a week my stepfather is at home, but otherwise I am alone unless I have a friend over.

When I am alone I do what I have to do first; then I watch TV, talk on the phone, listen to my radio or records. Sometimes I get lonely when there is nothing to do or it is raining. I get scared when our neighbor's alarm goes off because I am afraid that there is a robber nearby, but most of the time it is just the wind blowing the door open. Also, sometimes I get a prank call or someone comes to the door.

One day my friend and I were making something to eat and he cut his finger. I did not know what to do. Finally, I stayed calm and got a wet paper towel. Then my friend wrapped it around his finger. If a grownup was around it would all have been OK. Even if I were alone for 10 minutes something like that could happen.

I think it would be good to have an afterschool program with a lot of things to do. My mother tried to organize a basketball team after school, but the physical education teacher said the gym was not available.

Thank you.

Chairman **Miller**. Thank you very much, James, for your testimony.

Rebecca.

STATEMENT OF REBECCA J. HENSON, PARENT, FAIRFAX COUNTY, VA

Ms. **Henson**. Members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, we are here today to discuss a serious concern of parents—child care. Being a parent myself, especially a single one, quality child care that is fairly inexpensive is of the biggest concern to me, more so than housing, clothing, food, my job, et cetera. For without quality care that allows me to go to work without constantly worrying about my children I would not be able to earn the money to even afford those necessities.

I would like to offer my personal experience in finding good child care. I was raised in a home where, unlike many of the homes of today, my mother stayed home and raised us. She was there when the three of us left for school and there when we returned. She praised us in our accomplishments and disciplined us in our failures or faults.

It was not until the fourth and last was in elementary school that my mom took a part-time job, but still carried the tradition of being at home when he arrived from school. When my brother was in third grade, my parents separated and my mom went to work full time. My other brother, who was in high school, arrived at home first and watched my younger brother. That lasted for 2 years. Then my brother became a latchkey kid. But even then a neighbor next door in the apartment complex keeps an eye on him.

When I was 19 I got married and had my daughter Elizabeth. I was, at the time of my pregnancy, working as a cashier at Drug Fair. I took a leave of absence a month before she was born. Approximately 6 weeks after Beth was born I was back to work. From March of 1978 until September of 1979 I worked while Beth went to various individual sitters that I found mostly through ads, either mine or theirs, in the newspaper or at the local grocery store.

Then, in September of 1979, my husband got a better job and I was able to stay home. In order to help supplement the income, I babysat with one child full time and one part time. I had 20 months of my daughter to catch up on and we enjoyed every minute of it.

In October 1980 my husband lost his job and my job hunt was on. Being 4 months pregnant it was very hard to find a job, but I managed to at Marlo Furniture Co. That was the first time Beth went to a private day care center. I was very happy with the center. It eased my mind about the care she was receiving, both instructional and personal. I still felt guilty about "deserting" her, but it was not so bad knowing she was being taken good care of.

That center lasted 2 months. In December 1980 we had to move and ended up in Herndon. Being in Herndon was a far cry from the Lincolnia-Landmark area, so I ended up giving up my job and Beth's day care center.

In February 1981 my son was born. Three months after that I was again back to work. Both Beth and Ben went to individual sitters. We went through several sitters from then on—18 of them that I can remember, not all by names but by faces. Some were good, but we would end up moving away from them, and some were not so good, and the search for one better would begin again. Then there were the ones that were just plain horrid. These ranged from letting the kids run rampant to physically abusing the kids.

In August of 1982 my husband and I separated and I had no choice but to work. Finding housing, work, and good child care were my big jobs at first. In January of 1983, I found a house to share in Fairfax, a job in Annandale and a babysitter in-between. The babysitter was 5 miles from home, but she was one I could afford.

This meant I had to leave the house at 7:15 a.m., take the kids on the Metrobus to the sitter's, and catch another bus to work. This was fine in the summer but extremely depressing in the winter. Sometimes we would miss the bus and have to wait even longer for the next one, wrapped in a blanket, huddled together against the cold.

Every time the kids got sick, I berated myself for dragging them out. I constantly looked for a sitter closer to my home. There was a center in a church just one block from the house, but I could not afford the rates.

In April I switched my job to one in Rosslyn and moved to where I am now, in Lincolnia, around June 1. I again found a private individual to sit with the kids, but soon found I could not afford her rates. I ended up falling behind on the payments and was given the ultimatum of either catching up or finding another sitter.

Luckily I was able to put Elizabeth in the school-age child care program at the school where she was to begin kindergarten and Benjamin in the Annandale Christian Community for Action Day Care Center. Both are subsidized, so even with my salary we can survive.

I have here a comparison chart to give you an idea how the costs of child care figure greatly in my quest for quality care. My salary is $10,560 a year gross, which comes out to $669.33 take-home pay. Average normal expenses are approximately $450 to rent a two-bedroom, which most people would not let me rent because I have a boy and a girl; $77 for bus fare; $260 for child care full time at an average of $65 a week; and $180 child care for part-time at an average of $45 a week. It comes out to a total of $967 a month.

My costs now are $450 for rent, $70 for bus fare with a flashpass; $68 for child care for Beth; and $100 child care for Ben, $40 of which goes to ACCA and $60 to an individual sitter—which comes to a total of $688 a month.

If I was to stay home, the only cost I would have would be for my rent.

As you can see, my actual operating costs exceed my take-home pay by $19. I also receive $175 in child support which makes up that excess and leaves the rest for food. As you may have noticed, no where on the chart is there an allowance for food. That is because it is hard to exactly pinpoint how much will actually be spent in a month for it.

I try to budget $150 per month for that necessity, which then uses the rest of my monthly income. Another interesting note: that extra—and I use the term lightly—$175 child support will just pay my subsidized child care, or a little over a quarter of the normal rates for child care.

I know it sounds cruel, but cost and time figure greatly in the child care game. Parents first go for what they can afford and then what they can find the fastest. There is very little time to do extensive research on all the qualities a sitter or center may offer.

Many a time a parent has just gotten a job that requires them to start immediately and leaves them the weekend or less time to find a babysitter. So they pick one that is inexpensive and try to evaluate the sitter as time goes by. Sometimes it takes a very long time to find out that the center is very wrong for their child, especially if the child is very young.

I think there is a great need for a group that can help control and regulate the individual sitters and day care centers. The Office for Children has provided a good start by offering parents a list of sitters in their area. This list gives names, locations, phone numbers, and pertinent information such as type of care offered, whether trained through the Office for Children, and information about meals. About the only information it does not offer is cost and, of course, the quality of the care. The parent has to find that out for themselves.

I think there should be some way to rate the child care and affix a seal of approval. Help that is offered by the Government, either by a child care rating board, funds to centers, incentives to employers, et cetera, would benefit everyone, not just parents.

Employers will have lower absenteeism levels, crime will go down, if there are more centers available for kids after school and during the summer, less deaths—because of children being left alone who are too young to be—and more people working. I know there are lots of people who cannot, or will not get a job because they cannot find good quality care that they can afford.

For me, my children are the most important persons in my life and I want to be able to provide a healthy, happy, and safe environment for them to grow up in. In order to do this I have to work and cannot be with them constantly. Child care becomes a surrogate mother. In taking my place while I work, it has to be good.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you very much.

Ms. Rhones, you mentioned that you had turned down a pay increase so that you could keep your eligibility for child care.

Ms. RHONES. Yes.

Chairman MILLER. You have done that once or more than once?

Ms. RHONES. More than once.

Chairman MILLER. Yes, more than once—the ultimate private subsidy. Will you have to continue that?

Ms. RHONES. Until the baby is no longer eligible for day care or until I feel reasonably comfortable that she can come home by herself I will.

Chairman MILLER. You will continue to make the sacrifice of turning down an increase?

Ms. RHONES. It comes to a point where it is career versus children, and the raises, even though they look good, if you really add up through the year it is less than what it would actually cost if I have to find somebody to take care of the children, and it is easier because you know the child is in a setting that you feel secure with and you can trust these people rather than put them with a babysitter part time that you do not know what is going on.

Now that the children are of an age to talk, it might be better, but I have found out that my children tend to hold conspiracies. They keep things in and then after a while I find out something gross is happening.

Chairman MILLER. This is an interesting piece of information. Other studies have shown that some do not enter the work force because receiving public assistance allows them to retain medicaid and other benefits. Your testimony adds another dimension. Someone with a good salary, with four children who must make that same kind of logical economic calculation, but this time its to refuse advancement.

You are making the determination that all policymakers want you to make, and that is that your children are the most important individuals in your life. And when you pick your children over your career you are also telling us that you are picking quality care over that career.

Certainly all the members of this committee want parents who feel this way about their children.

But if you make that choice, you are going to be penalized for putting your children first. And again from what studies we have seen concerning women on public assistance, that same determination is made and the same penalty is paid for making the choice of children over work.

James, when you are home alone, are you allowed to have friends come over to your house?

Master GITHENS. Yes.

Chairman MILLER. OK. Are you allowed to go over to other friends' houses or are you required to stay in the house?

Master GITHENS. I can go to other people's.

Chairman MILLER. You can?

Master GITHENS. Yes.

Chairman MILLER. What about Aaron and Carletha? Were you required to stay in the house when you were staying home alone?

Ms. RHONES. Yes.

Master Rhones. Yes.

Chairman MILLER. You were not allowed to go outside?

Miss RHONES. No.

Chairman MILLER. You look like somebody who might have gone outside once or twice. [Laughter.]

Chairman MILLER. You just have that look, Carletha, that suggests to me that maybe once or twice you left your house for a short period. But the rule was, apparently, Ms. Rhones, for their safety that they were not to go outside.

Ms. RHONES. Well, having someone else's child in the home, if they got hurt I would not be there and I would be responsible for that child. Then, if they were at someone else's house, if anything happened—and I am not going to say I have angels, because my children will get into things all right and become hurt.

Chairman MILLER. Cutting up the plants tipped us off. [Laughter.]

Ms. RHONES. I thought I never had a green thumb.

Chairman MILLER. Aren't we restricting children who would expect a normal experience after school playing with their friends? For children who are left home alone play is restricted, again out of the desire of the parent for the well-being and safety of the child.

Ms. RHONES. Right, and I also found that sending them home and keeping them from others produced a lot of idle time, and I truly became a firm believer in idle time is the devil's workshop, because my kids—I cannot remember what they have not gotten into or what they have not ventured to experiment with.

Living in a neighborhood where they can just look out the window and see drug abuse constantly or an alcoholic falling down, they were prime suspects and when the baby was 3 years old and came to me with a piece of toilet paper rolled up and said I have got my "rigerette," it was like where did you see this. Where did it come from?

Things like this, you know, you are trying to isolate them from the world to keep them from being exposed to these things, but all you have to do really is look out the window. But in order to keep them from becoming prey to those persons out there that do not care what age the children are—just to make a sale or get somebody hooked, to become involved in the business—is also a scary thing.

Aaron when he was in kindergarten was a member of an extortion gang and, you know, I am saying what does he know about extortion. But then he had the older children that lived in the apartment complex that encouraged him and said, "Man, your mother will not know."

This was exciting to Aaron because he had not socialized with children. His thing was oh, I can get out and do something different, and it was exciting to him to try something different.

Chairman **Miller**. Now he is in the high achievement program.

Ms. **Rhones**. Yes.

Chairman **Miller**. All right, Aaron.

Congressman McKernan.

Mr. **McKernan**. Thank you. I would like to, I guess, just address Ms. Rhones, the mother. First of all, a number of us are very interested in this whole issue of latchkey children and one of the issues that has come up is whether or not that term might be changed—whether there might be some other way of describing the children. I am obviously open to any suggestions that you might have.

How do you feel just about that—the problem of after-school child care being referred to as the latchkey children problem? Do you have any comments on that?

Ms. **Rhones**. Well, my experiences were that the key was constantly being lost. I was constantly changing locks just for security's sake. That sending them home alone—that when we talked at night they really did not like it, and being children, you know, we as adults tend to feel that children do not suffer from stress, but I learned after about 3 years they have a lot of mental stress, and I was putting a lot of adult responsibilities on each of the children.

And I realized that latchkey children was not the answer. And "latchkey" is an adequate phrase.

Ms. **Bai Clay**. I would like to add something to that. A rose is still a rose by any other name. Whatever you change the terminology to, children are still unattended. They have many hours before a parent comes home from work, from the time they get out of school until the parent comes home, and there is no adult supervision for them.

I know there are programs now in existence through various agencies where there are checking systems. There are family day care providers who will care for maybe five after-school children, not necessarily in her own home, for the major part of the time. It is a person that they can go to after school, say hi, I am on my way home now. I live around the corner. I will be back after I do my homework, maybe for a snack.

The provider knows the child is going to soccer practice or will be down the block with another playmate. It is someone that this child knows that they can come to in an emergency—if they are frightened, if they are hurt, or just to be with and to talk to.

So I do not know that the terminology is——

Mr. **McKernan**. You do not see the terminology is the important part of the issue?

Ms. **Bai Clay**. I do not.

Mr. **McKernan**. Aaron and Carletha, do you go to your day care at the school, the same place as the school, or do you go somewhere else for your day care?

Ms. Rhones. We go right where the school is.

Mr. **McKernan**. It is right at your school?

Master **Rhones**. Yes.

Ms. **Rhones**. Yes.

Mr. **McKernan**. James, how would you feel about some kind of a program where you would stay at the school with some other kids and do various activities rather than go home to your house?

Master **Githens**. Well, I have had like 4 years of experience of that, just about, and I thought it was really fun, and I like to be around my friends after school, so we could talk and play sports and stuff.

Mr. **McKernan**. So you would like to be able to have some kind of supervision after school at the school?

Master **Githens**. Yes, yes, and then maybe some days I would not, like if I had a friend coming over or something.

Mr. **McKernan**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman **Miller**. Congressman Wolf.

Mr. **Wolf**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to thank the panel. In the interest of time and so we can hear from the next panel, I have no questions.

Chairman **Miller**. Congressman Marriott.

Mr. **Marriott**. I am sorry I missed your testimony. I have been briefed on the importance of what you have said and I just want to ask a couple of quick questions in terms of the family day care.

I assume—you are Margaret?

Ms. **Bai Clay**. Yes.

Mr. **Marriott**. I assume that is your business. A lot of people tell me they do not want to put in-house day care centers together because you just cannot make any money. Although we should do a lot of things for other than financial rewards, can you just comment on how profitable it is? Can you make enough money? Is it worthwhile? How can we encourage people to be more involved in day care programs if the cost is a problem? Could you address that?

Ms. **Bai Clay**. Sure. As far as profit in family day care, there is very little profit. What family day care does is it affords a woman who may have to stay home with her own children because she cannot find day care or because she cannot find employment, it affords her the opportunity to earn a living in her own home.

Very often what happens is that she starts out doing this for a neighbor's child and she is paid for it. Oftentimes it starts out as simply a reimbursement—you know, what I lay out for lunch or whatever, I take the kids to a park.

So private and family day care, there is very little profit. As I said, it affords a person to be self-sufficient at home and take care of her own children. If we are addressing the problem of many women who need extra maternity leave—and there are those who feel that women need to be home with their children and be priority care givers, which is absolutely true—it may not be economically feasible for this person to stay home.

So if we can develop maternity leave systems that are adequate for mothers, to encourage them to stay home, why not encourage them into the field of family day care by more training and other programs. They can stay home with their own children, provide care for a women who is not as fortunate as she to stay home.

Mr. **Marriott**. To provide a quality day care environment, what is the maximum number of children that you can handle in your home?

Ms. **Bai Clay**. In my county it is five children or less. Now in Arlington County I know there is an adult-to-child ratio, infants under the age of 2 you may have a helper if you have four or five infants. In some States, for instance in Arizona and Texas, I believe that the maximum number of children you can care for is five; however, if you have three children of your own it only affords you the opportunity to take care of two other day care children because they are counted into the registration.

So there is no consistent method of establishing family day care procedures throughout the States. Each State and local government has its own.

Mr. **Marriott**. Joan, may I ask where you work?

Ms. **Rhones**. In Bethesda, MD for IBM.

Mr. **Marriott**. So you have a pretty good job?

Ms. **Rhones**. Yes.

Mr. **Marriott**. Does IBM provide any day care, child assistance to you at all in any of their fringe benefits programs?

Ms. **Rhones**. No, they do not, and all the work that we put forth and all the effort that we have tried to encourage them just to provide space have been declined because they feel that enough day care centers and nurseries and Montessori schools are in the vicinity, and when we point out the fact that they take a large chunk of our salary out, it seems to be very insignificant.

They are not yet sensitive to our needs.

Mr. **Marriott**. What grades are Carletha and Aaron in?

Ms. **Rhones**. Carletha is in the fifth, Aaron's in the fourth, and I have not allowed them to be skipped because if they do that would break up the continuity, and the two younger ones would be left with the older ones to oversee them.

Mr. **Marriott**. Is there anything provided in their schools for after-school care—any kind of programs for them in the school?

Ms. **Rhones**. OK. The school has provided space for a nonprofit agency to come in and set up a day care association and they are in a before and after school program.

Mr. **Marriott**. So that is where they stay after school until you can come to get them?

Ms. **Rhones**. Right, and before school.

Mr. **Marriott**. Let me just conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying as soon as I walked in the room and saw the smiles of Carletha and Aaron I was impressed because one of my favorite basketball players is Magic Johnson, and he has such a nice smile and I thought you were the children of Magic Johnson when I came in because you have such nice smiles.

I want to again apologize for not being here. I appreciate your testimony.

Chairman **Miller**. Thank you. Again, this panel raises a whole series of issues which we are going to have to address, and I appreciate the spectrum of testimony that you have provided us. A number of these issues should not go unanswered, even including what James has said about his mother trying to organize a basketball team, but not being allowed to use the gym after school—the little problems that we cannot address at the Federal level. Or the fact that the Navy has declared the "Month of the Child," yet they do not seem to have child care program for their career employees.

I thank you for raising some of these issues. James and Carletha and Aaron, thank you very much for sitting through the hearing with us this morning and giving us the opportunity to hear from you. We wish you well.

Next we will hear from a panel made up of Ann Yeamans, who is a parent from Olney, MD; Muriel Hughes, who is a parent from Wheaton, MD; and Linda Burton, who will be accompanied by Cheri Loveless, who represents Mothers-At-Home from Vienna, VA.

Welcome to the committee. Again, your prepared testimony will be placed in the record in its entirety and we want you to proceed in the manner in which you are most comfortable.

First we will hear from Ms. Yeamans.

STATEMENT OF ANN YEAMANS, PARENT, OLNEY, MD

Ms. YEAMANS. My name is Ann Yeamans. I am married and the mother of two children—Jeff, who is 14, and Sarah, who is 11 at present. I am also the chairman of the Olney Extended Day Center in Olney, MD, center co-rep to the executive committee of Montgomery Child Day Care Association, and an elected member of the board of directors of MCDCA.

Olney Extended Day Center provides before- and after-school care to some 50 children who attend kindergarten through grade five in the greater Olney area. Full-day care is also provided on school holidays, snow days, and during summer vacations. The center is housed in two classrooms of Olney Elementary School, and is fully licensed by the Montgomery County Health Department. Space for the center is rented from Montgomery County Public Schools in accord with MCPS joint occupancy policies and procedures.

Montgomery Child Day Care Association is a nonprofit organization serving as an umbrella resource for nine centers which provide care to 729 children at 14 locations in Montgomery County; 62 percent of the children served are of school age; 38 percent are preschool.

Sixty-three percent of MCDCA families are full fee-paying families. Purchase of care for 37 percent of the children is contracted with Montgomery County Department of Social Services.

Day care as a personal issue began for me some 6 years ago in early 1978. As a pediatric nurse who had been out of the work force for nearly 9 years, I was sensitive to both national and local concerns regarding the shortage of professional nurses. The appropriateness of again using my technical skills seemed totally clear, except for one urgent question: How could I best provide for the care of my own children, who were then ages 5 and 8 in order to provide nursing care for children in the general population?

Concurrent to my own reflections, area community leaders met and expressed their concern for the day-to-day faring of latchkey children. There was good day care in the area from a few family providers, but the numbers of such mothers in our growing population of more than 20,000 was very few. The nearest group day care provider was more than 7 miles away.

The principal of the local elementary school offered to make space available in her building for latchkey care. Five parents and I quickly responded by agreeing to commit our efforts to addressing Olney's needs. Day care programs, issues and trends were extensively researched. School and community support was carefully nurtured. Fundraising efforts were actively initiated. The group vigorously sought membership in Montgomery County Child Day Care Association in order to provide administrative stability as well as to bring overall expertise to the new venture.

We also established meticulous criteria:

First, that multiple age grouping would liken the center to a large family or neighborhood experience.

Second, activities would be inclusive of those available to children who were at home at the beginning and end of the school day as well as those which would be creative and enriching.

Third, child and parent involvement would be solicited in planning activities and establishing goals.

Fourth, staff selection would be based on education, experience, and quality of interactions with children.

Fifth, programs of care would be expanded only when existing programs were operating well.

In these past 6 years the Olney Extended Day Center has indeed expanded its programs of care. It has also established itself simultaneously as both an integral part of the greater Olney community and as an active member of the vital day care constituency.

Issues concerning day care have long been raised in Montgomery County. Particularly in the political campaigns of 1982, parents joined with professionals in urging county leaders to explore the issues of quality, cost, location, transportation, and referral. These issues are documented and outlined in my attachment, which is "Child Day Care: An Important Issue for the 1980's."

In considering the issue of quality, the quality of Montgomery County's programs directly relates to the qualifications of the care givers. Sadly, it is my understanding that the pool of qualified child care providers is decreasing even as the need for nurturing care is increasing. Low pay and "burn out" are directing existing good care providers away from the profession. Wider career options are greatly reducing both the number and the quality of entry level providers. Is this not an issue critical for this committee to address?

The cost of day care is increasingly becoming a burden to working families everywhere, regardless of whether they are two working-parent families, single parent mom families, or single parent dad families. Present income guidelines for reimbursement exclude a large number of families whose incomes fall just above the cutoff point.

It is these parents who often must choose to latchkey their children regardless of the child's or their own peace of mind. This issue is also addressed in my attachment.

The issue of locations of centers has been complicated in Montgomery County by the recent closure of many low-enrolled schools which also contained child care facilities. The movement of centers to other than neighborhood school locations has raised the issue of transportation. Who will transport and who will pay?

A joint effort of the county executive, the county council, and MCPS has responded to this problem. The recent transportation policy does indeed provide for transportation; however, it also adds to the provider's cost of providing quality care.

The issue of information and referral has also received direct action in our jurisdiction. On March 15, 1984, the Child Care Connection, a private, nonprofit agency, opened under the direction of Mrs. Fran Abrams to provide the coordination for these services. The agency is under contract to the county government, with financial assistance also provided by an area employer. It is my understanding that H.R. 2242 as introduced by Barbara Mikulski addresses this need.

Most certainly the issues confronting day care in the 1980's and on into the 1990's are both numerous and diverse. For too long these issues have been in a large part closet issues—both in the private sector and at all levels of government.

I compliment this committee's identification of child care issues to date. Further, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you. And, finally, and most importantly, I look forward to your active involvement in addressing the solutions.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Ann Yeamans follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ANN YEAMANS, PARENT, OLNEY, MD

My name is Ann Yeamans. My home is at 17516 Queen Elizabeth Drive in Olney, Maryland. I am married and the mother of two children: Jeff, who is presently 14, and Sarah, who is 11.

I am also the chairman of the Olney Extended Day Center in Olney, Center co-representative to the Executive Committee of Montgomery Child Day Care Association [MCDCA], and an elected member of the Board of Directors of MCDCA.

Olney extended Day Center provides before and after school care to some 50 children who attend kindergarten thru grade 5 in the greater Olney area. Full-day care is also provided on school holidays, snow days, and during summer vactions. The Center is housed in two classrooms of Olney Elementary School and is fully licensed by the Montgomery County Health Department. Space for the Center is rented from Montgomery County Public Schools [MCPS] in accord with MCPS joint Occupancy policy and procedures.

Montgomery Child Day Care Association is a non-profit organization serving as an umbrella resource for nine centers which provide care to 729 children at 14 locations in Montgomery County, Maryland. 62% of the children served are of school age while 38% are preschool children. Presently, 63% of MCDCA families are full-fee paying families. Purchase of care for 37% of the children is contracted with Montgomery County Department of Social Services.

Day care as a personal issue began for me some six years ago in early 1978. As a pediatric nurse who had been out of the full-time work force for nearly nine years, I was sensitive to both national and local concerns regarding the shortage of professional nurses.

The appropriateness of again using my technical skills seemed totally clear except for one urgent question:

"How could I best provide for the care of my own children (who were then ages 5 and 8) in order to provide nursing care for children in the general population?"

Concurrent to my own reflections, area community leaders met in a session of the Northeast Forum to express concern for the day-to-day faring of "latch-key children". Although good day care was being provided by a few family providers such as Mrs. Jo Frock of Olney, the numbers of such mothers in our growing population of more than 20,000 was very few. The nearest group day care provider was more than seven miles away and tended to serve families of its own community.

Olney Elementary Principal, Dr. Marguerite Bridge, offered to make space available in her building for latch key care. Five Olney parents, the Mrs. Diane Davies, Sue Garten, Eleanor Kaul, Pam Shirley, and I quickly responded by agreeing to commit our efforts to addressing Olney's need.

Day care programs, issues, and trends were extensively researched. School and community support was carefully nurtured. Fund-raising efforts were actively initiated. The group vigorously sought membership in Montgomery Child Day Care Association in order to provide administrative stability as well as to bring overall expertise to the new venture.

The coordinating committee also meticulously established Center criteria as follows:

Multiple age grouping would liken the Center to a large family or neighborhood experience.

Activities would be inclusive of those available to children who were at home at the beginning and end of the school day as well as those which would be creative and enriching.

Child and parent involvement would be solicited in planning activities and establishing goals.

Staff selection would be based on education, experience, and quality of interactions with children.

Programs of care would be expanded only when existing programs were operating well.

In these past six years, the Olney Extended Day Center has indeed expanded its programs of care. It has also established itself simultaneously as both an integral part of the greater Olney community and as an active member of the vital day care constituency.

Issues concerning day care have long been raised in Montgomery County. Particularly, in the political campaigns of 1982, parents joined with professionals in urging county leaders to explore the issues of quality, cost, location, transportation, and referral. These issues are documented and outlined well in my attachment, *Child Day Care: An Important Issue for the 80's.*

In considering the issue of quality, the quality of Montgomery County's programs directly relates to the qualifications of the care givers. Sadly, it is my understanding that the pool of qualified child care providers is decreasing even as the need for nurturing care is increasing. Low pay and "burn-out" are directing existing good care providers away from the profession. Wider career options are greatly reducing both the number and the quality of entry level providers. Is this not an issue critical for this committee to address?

The cost of day care is increasingly becoming a burden to working families everywhere regardless of whether they are two-working parent families, single parent (Mom) families, or single parent (Dad) families. Present income guidelines for reimbursement exclude a large number of families whose incomes fall just above the cutoff point. It is these parents who often must choose to "latch key" their children irregardless of the child's or their own peace of mind. This issue is also addressed in my attachment, *Child Day Care,* etc.

The issue of location of centers has been complicated in Montgomery County by the recent closure of many low-enrolled schools which also contained child care facilities. The movement of centers to other than neighborhood school locations has raised the issue of transportation: Who will transport? Who will pay? A joint effort of the County Executive, the County Council, and MCPS has responded to this problem. The recent Transportation Policy does indeed provide for transportation. However, it also adds to the provider's cost of providing quality care.

The issue of information and referral has also received direct action in our jurisdiction. On March 15, 1984, the Child Care Connection, a private non-profit agency, opened under the direction of Mrs. Fran Abrams to provide the coordination for these services. The agency is under contract to the county government with financial assistance also provided by an area employer. It is my understanding that H.R. 2242 as introduced by Barbara Mikulski (D-Md) addresses this need.

Most certainly, the issues confronting day care in the 80's and on into the 90's are both numerous and diverse. For too long these issues have been in a large part "closet issues"—both in the private sector and at all levels of government.

I compliment this committee's identification of child care issues to date. Further, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you. And finally, and most importantly, I look forward to your active involvement in addressing the solutions.

Chairman. **Miller**. Thank you.

Ms. Hughes.

STATEMENT OF MURIEL POSTON HUGHES, PARENT, WHEATON, MD

Ms. HUGHES. I would like to thank the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families for giving me the opportunity to address some issues and concerns I as a working parent have regarding child care. A particular concern of mine is infant and toddler care.

I have two children—one, a son age 8, and the second, a daughter age 2½. I think the differences in their experiences in child care illustrate the varying attitudes of State and local jurisdictions in different parts of the country and how this impacts on finding and obtaining quality care for young children.

My daughter was born in 1981 in Montgomery County in Maryland, and when she was 4 months old I, for both financial and personal reasons, returned to my job as a faculty member at Howard University. There were, and are, only two options available to working parents of infants in Montgomery County, both of which have limitations. One is in-home care which because of the cost is available to only a few families, and the second and primary form of infant care is family day care. I utilized both of these forms in the process of providing child care for my daughter while she was under the age of 2.

The first form of child care we used was family day care. The referrals for licensed family day care homes are sent to parents seeking child care by the Department of Social Services in the county and I received referrals to over 60 family day care providers between the time she was born and when she was placed in child care.

Not all of these referrals had openings for infants, because a licensed family day care home may have a total of only six children, including the provider's own, and may have only 2 children under the age of 24 months. This limit of two children under the age of two reduces the number of available homes for infants, and of the referrals I received over three-quarters of these did not have openings.

Consequently, I read ads in the local paper and ran an ad as well. I visited the homes of many family day care providers who had openings, and there were some licensed homes with obvious health hazards. One family day care home I visited was so overcrowded it would have been impossible to evacuate in case of fire the seven children she already had, not inlcuding my own.

Another site had as a primary play area a basement with holes in the wall paneling. In a third, the provider in the process of showing me her back yard left two toddlers and an infant unattended in her house. Additionally many homes already had two children under the age of 2, but these providers liked babies so much that they were willing to take on mine. With a total ratio of one adult per six children in a licensed family day care home it is difficult to provide even custodial infant care; quality infant care is another matter altogether.

We ended up placing my daughter in an unlicensed home with a provider who responded to my ad, and this provider cared for my daughter, a toddler, and her own child, who was 3 years old, giving us a ratio of one-to-three and not one-to-six.

This was at a cost of $85 a week. Although I have not addressed the issue of cost, since my primary concern was availability, I would like to note that the fees charged in family day care homes I visited ranged from $40 a week to $125 a week for full day care, Monday through Friday.

Within 3 months of placing my daughter in this family day care home, the provider told me she would be unable to continue to provide care because she was moving. This time we chose to use the second option available to parents seeking infant care, and that was to have someone come into our home. In-home care is prohibitively expensive for the full-time working parent, with costs beginning at $167.50 under current minimum wage laws and ranging higher for hours 8 to 6 p.m. Monday through Friday.

These costs do not reflect the additional factors of employer social security payments, unemployment insurance, taxes and workman's compensation. Although my husband is a physician, we were unable to continue to afford full-time child care and consequently only utilized our in-home child care provider 30 hours, at a cost of $100 a week, and split our schedules.

I would like to note that at this time our elementary school age child was in an after-school program, and our total child care costs were in excess of $700 per month.

Another problem besides the cost with in-home care is that there is little opportunity for social interaction with other children, which is one of the most stimulating experiences for infants and toddlers.

Because of our concerns about the cost and the lack of social interaction with in-home infant care, we again placed our child in a family day care home, which this time was licensed and she stayed there from the time she was 12 months until she was over 2 years of age and able to attend preschool. This meant that Elissa had been in three different child care situations within her first 12 months.

Given the inadequacies of the two options for infant care—that is, family day care and in-home care—there is another alternative which I think should be available in all jurisdictions, and that is center-based infant care. Such facilities would provide a staff trained in early childhood education where infant learning abilities could be knowledgeably encouraged. The adult-infant ratio would be lower than the 1-to-6 found in most family day care homes.

The physical plant would be able to provide age-appropriate play areas for infants and toddlers. Most importantly, there would be sufficient monitoring through regulatory licensing of these larger facilities.

This brings me to the contrasting story of my son's infant child care. My son was born in 1975 while my husband and I were students at the University of California at Los Angeles. My son, along with 11 other children, was part of a parent-infant child care co-op used by faculty, staff, and students of UCLA, and he stayed there from the age of 6 months until he was over 2 and able to attend preschool.

The trained staff provided reliable quality care with a staff ratio of 1-to-3, and the socialization between infants and toddlers was something very important to his development. His vocabulary at 19 months was in excess of 300 words, and both his pediatrician and the center director felt this was in large part due to his interaction with other toddlers. Consistent quality care is of greatest importance to infants, and the professional staff of the co-op provided my son with that care.

The differences in the experiences in infant care of my two children highlight some of the problems with the availability and quality of infant care. If you live where I do now, there are only two options available for working parents—that is, family day care or in-home care. Both of these are inadequate because of enforcement of the licensing regulations, specifically health hazards and over-enrollment in the former and cost in the latter.

My previous experience in California demonstrated that quality center-based care can be developed to meet the needs of infants and their working parents, and I believe this alternative should be an option in all jurisdictions. Availability of quality infant care, no matter what form, is, of course, the primary problem and one which should not be limited by the vagaries of local jurisdictions but should be met on a nationwide basis.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Muriel Poston Hughes follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MURIEL POSTON HUGHES, PARENT, WHEATON, MD

I would like to thank the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families for giving me the opportunity to address some issues and concerns I, as a working parent, have regarding child care. A particular concern of mine is infant and toddler care. I have two children: one, a son, age eight and the second, a daughter, age two and a half. I think the differences in their experiences in child care illustrate the varying attitudes of state and local jurisdictions in different parts of the country, and how this impacts on finding and obtaining quality care for young children.

My daughter was born in 1981 in Montgomery County in Maryland, and when she was 4 months old I, for both financial and personal reasons, returned to my job as a faculty member at Howard University. There were, and are, only two options available to working parents of infants in Montgomery County and both of which have limitations. One is in-home care which because of the cost is available to only a few families, and the second and primary form of infant care is family day care. I utilized both of these forms in the process of providing child care for my daughter while she was under the age of two.

Referrals for licensed family day care homes are sent to parents seeking child care by the Department of Social Services of the county, and I received referrals to over 60 FDC providers between the time she was born and when she was placed in child care. Not all of these referrals had openings for infants because a licensed FDC home may have a total of only six children including the providers' own and may have only two children under the age of two. This limit of two children under the age of two reduces the number of available homes for infants, and of the referrals I received over ¾ of these did not have openings for infants. Consequently, I read ads in the local paper and ran an ad as well. I visited the homes of many FDC providers who had openings and there were some licensed homes with obvious health hazards—one home I visited was so overcrowded it would have been impossible to evacuate (in case of fire) the seven children she already had not including mine; another had, as the primary play area, a basement with holes in the paneling; in a third the provider, in the process of showing me her backyard, left two toddlers and an infant unattended in the house. Additionally, many homes already had two children under the age of two but these providers "liked babies so much" that they were willing to take mine. With a total ratio of one adult/six children in a licensed FDC home it is difficult to provide custodial infant care, quality infant care is another matter all together.

I ended up placing my daughter in an unlicensed home with a provider who had responded to my ad, and the provider cared for my daughter, a toddler and her own child who was 3 years old (giving me a ratio of 1:3 not 1:6). This was at a cost of $85.00/wk. Although I have not addressed the issue of cost, since my primary problem was availability, I would like to note that the fees charged ranged from $40.00/wk. to $125.00/wk. for full day care Monday-Friday.

Within three months of placing my daughter the provider told me she would be unable to continue to provide care for her because she was moving. This time I chose to use the second option available to parents seeking infant care and that was to have someone come into my home. In-home child care is prohibitively expensive for the full-time working parent with costs beginning at $167.50 (under current minimum wage laws) and ranging higher for hours from 8–6 pm Monday–Friday. These costs do not reflect the additional factors of employer social security payments, unemployment insurance, taxes and workman's compensation. Although my husband is a physician we were unable to continue to afford full time child care and consequently only utilized our in-home child care provider thirty hours a week and split our schedules. Another problem (besides the cost) with in-home care is that there is little opportunity for social interaction with other childern, which is one of the most stimulating experiences for infants and toddlers. Because of our concerns about the cost and the lack of social interaction with in-home/infant care we again placed our daughter in a family day care home, which was licensed, and she stayed there from the time she was 12 months until she was over two years of age and able to attend pre-school.

Given the inadequacies of the two options for infant care i.e. family day care and in-home care, there is another alternative which I think should be available in all jurisdictions and that is center-based infant care. Such facilities would provide a staff trained in early childhood education where infant learning abilities could be knowledgeably encouraged. The adult/infant ratio would be lower than the 1:6 found in most family day care homes. The physical plant would be able to provide age appropriate play areas for infants and toddlers. Most importantly, there would be sufficient monitoring, through regulatory licensing, of these larger facilities.

This brings me to the contrasting story of my son's infant child care. My son was born in 1975 while my husband and I were students at the University of California at Los Angeles. My son along with 11 other children was part of a parent-infant child care co-op for faculty, staff and students of UCLA, and he stayed there from the age of 6 months until he was over two and able to attend pre-school. The trained staff provided reliable quality child care and the socialization between infants and toddlers was something very important to his development. His vocabulary at 19 months was in excess of 300 words and both his pediatrician and the center director felt this was in large part due to his interaction with other toddlers. Consistent quality care is of greatest importance to infants and the professional staff provided my son with such care.

The differences in the experiences in infant care for my two children highlight some of the problems with the availability and quality of infant child care. If you live in a jurisdiction, as I do now, there are only two options available for working parents i.e. family day care or in home care. Both of these are inadequate because of enforcement of the licensing regulations in the former and cost in the latter. My previous experience in California demonstrated that quality center based care can be developed to meet the needs of infants and their working parents, and I believe this alternative should be an option in all jurisdictions. Availability of quality infant care no matter what form is, of course, the primary problem and one which should not be limited by the vagaries of local jurisdictions but should be met on a nationwide basis.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you.
Miss Burton.

STATEMENT OF LINDA BURTON, MOTHERS-AT-HOME, VIENNA, VA, ACCOMPANIED BY CHERI LOVELESS, MOTHERS-AT-HOME

Ms. BURTON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Linda Burton. I live in Springfield, VA. I am accompanied by Cheri Loveless of Vienna, VA. Along with another Vienna resident, Janet Dittmer, we are founders of Mothers-At-Home, a support organization for mothers who choose to stay home. Our monthly publication, Welcome Home, which began distribution only 3 months ago, has subscribers in 50 States and 2 foreign countries.

Less than 6 months ago we began speaking out on the subject of mothers who choose not to enter the paid work force while their children need them at home. When our statements were made public women across the Nation responded immediately in extraordinary numbers.

We heard from mothers in urban areas and mothers in rural areas, mothers who called themselves liberals and mothers who considered themselves conservatives, mothers of preschoolers and mothers of teens, mothers who have never worked outside the home and mothers who work full time. Until statistics are compiled, we cannot state what percentage each of these categories represents of the total response; however, it is clear that the mothers writing to us cross all political, religious, and socio-economic lines, with no particular group the obvious majority.

We wish to point out that our group, Mothers-At-Home, is not political. We do not lobby on behalf of any political party or organization. However, we are happy to play an educational role and it is in that capacity that we appear here today.

Everywhere there are demands for more quality day care. The report you printed in December 1983 on the demographic and social trends affecting care for dependents indicates that an already-critical problem is going to get much worse. At this time most efforts to solve the Nation's massive child care problems center around discovering ways to create more day care and ways to upgrade the quality of that care.

Based on the information coming to us in the form of letters and phone calls from mothers of all backgrounds and circumstances, we strongly suggest that another approach to the problem be investigated—that of bringing home the many mothers who do work who would rather be at home, who would rather not have their children in day care in the first place.

These mothers, who work only because of economic and social pressures, could be given incentives to remain home with their children. Taking their children out of day care would make more care available to the mothers who still choose to work.

Mothers who do require day care for their children clearly must have access to the best care available, but they are not going to get it from an overburdened child care system. Seldom do "more" and "quality" go hand-in-hand, and in the case of an issue so deeply human as child care this is particularly so.

We cannot legislate or exercise quality controls over the capacity of one human being to love and care for another. If the child care experience as we hear about from many former and current working mothers is an accurate indication of the kind of child care most mothers are finding, then perhaps the attempt to create more day care merely hits the symptom rather than the root of the problem.

Our mail indicates that many mothers are working simply to provide economic stability for their families and that they view day care as a necessary evil rather than as an acceptable alternative. A mother from Fairfax, VA, writes:

> You are quite right when you state there is little else besides money drawing mothers to salaried jobs. I work with large numbers of such women both in my 9-to-5 job and in my volunteer work as director of the Women's Center.

A working mother in Allentown, PA, shares her feelings this way:

> I am a working mother, albeit a very, very reluctant one. My daughter will be 6 months old tomorrow and not a day goes by without me grieving over losing these precious days with her. I have to work, but my husband and I are doing everything possible to get ourselves on our feet financially so I can work part time by autumn.

More subtle than economic pressures to work, but possibly more of an influence on the state of child care in the Nation is the social pressure mothers feel. In the past 20 years we have fostered a generation of young people who have heard nothing but put-downs about child rearing. They have been massively encouraged to do something more important with their lives.

Mothering has no prestige. While we as a nation continue to respect motherhood, we have very little respect for its mothers. The mothers our organization has heard from believe they are considered intellectually inferior and out of pace with the times. They feel dismissed as self-indulgent, lazy people whose job could be easily replaced by an institution.

A typical mother from Sacramento, CA, writes:

> I am so tired of certain people looking down on me because I am only a housewife. Even my husband, who supports my decision to remain at home, thinks I do practically nothing all day long. People seem to think that a woman who stays home with her child is not quite right, that she has nothing important to say.

Another woman, this one from Destrehan, LA, comments:

> I have often jokingly thought that there should be a Homebodies Anonymous, wherein all of the members admit, I am a mother at home. I am embarrassed to admit that I no longer hold a professional title." I have long been and still am an avid supporter of NOW, but admit to confusion as to my role since I quite working. I hold a degree in mathematics and was the dean of academics at a private school. Somehow, I feel a need to tell people of my past accomplishments, certain that they would think me dull were I to tell them of the joys of being a mother-homemaker.

From Dale, TX, the wife of a CPA writes:

> The pressure from our society makes us feel that if we don't work outside the home we can do nothing else.

A mother from New Jersey who does volunteer work with child abusers explains:

> Low housewife image and isolation are at the top of the list for unhappy mothers—and therefore child neglect or abuse.

A working mother from Rochester, NY, writes:

> I am not at home, but would like to be. It is a shame that I was brainwashed while in college into thinking I must work outside the home.

When it becomes increasingly evident that the business of raising children is beneath the national dignity, then intelligent, skilled, compassionate people are not likely to want the job. Nor are they likely to want to staff day care centers to take care of other people's children.

Our correspondence from mothers across the Nation strongly indicates that the establishment of economic incentives and social sanctions for those who prefer to raise their own children at home would have an impact. We run a risk in suggesting specific measures because we feel that single suggestions can too easily be shot down as impractical, thus damaging the larger proposition. Therefore, we will cite some examples which should be treated as a springboard for further discussion.

Father William Byron, president of Washington, DC's Catholic University, has suggested mothers be accorded social credits for each year they remain at home, which would be redeemable as either higher education for their children or civil service points for themselves.

A mother who wrote to us from Newman, CA, lists several suggestions. Among them are a significant tax break for mothers who do not work outside the home, the establishment of social security benefits for homemakers, and the right to put into an IRA the same amount allowed her working spouse.

Benefits similar to those given veterans, such as special mortgage packages and special loans would aid mothers like one who writes us from Baltimore, MD.

> All I have ever wanted to be since the age of 13 is a mother at home. At 37 I expected to be settled down with two or three kids living the American dream, but such is not the case. Within the first year of our daughter's life my husband went into a deep depression. We lost our house because my husband wouldn't or couldn't keep up with the payments.
>
> I received and receive no child care, but I was determined to stay with my daughter, for whom I had waited so long. With the help of my father-in-law I got a lease on a word processor and for almost three years I have been working from my home, and taking care of my daughter. But the business will not survive unless I can expand, and I can't get any credit or find an investor. I don't want to leave home.

Certainly the Government could take the lead in recognizing the skills a woman develops as a homemaker when considering past mothers at home for jobs. A Woodbridge, VA, mother writes:

> At one time I worked for the Astronaut Affairs Office with NASA headquarters in Washington, DC. It was a very glamorous job. I met many astronauts, scheduled lunar samples all over the world, and I loved it. But my job as a homemaker is much more demanding and requires good management skills, not only in management of people but resources and time as well.

Perhaps incentives could also be given to the private sector to encourage exploration of innovative ways to aid mothers who want to be home with their children but cannot for financial reasons. We have heard about a college which frees its mother employees over the summer months to allow them to be with their children while college students fill in for them.

In the fall, when children have returned to school, the mothers are welcomed back to their full-time positions. Perhaps some businesses would see fit to issue special discount cards or to offer other special treatments such as servicemen and senior citizens are given.

These are some measures that have been suggested by the people who write to us. Some of these measures may work. None of them may work. Or variations of a few of them in concert may work. We are not here to tell you precisely what measures should be taken. We are here to tell you that thousands of mothers working both inside and outside the home want desperately to raise their own children.

If you find a way to help them do that, both working mothers and mothers at home will benefit. It would greatly improve the quality of existing day care by forcing the removal of the chaff from our obviously overburdened child care system. It would vastly enhance the overall quality of child care in this country by ensuring that a great many more children would receive the full-time individual nurturing that they deserve.

Finally, economic relief and social sanction for mothers at home would be a strong endorsement of the advocacy of choice—the belief that women should be able to choose what they want to do with their lives. As it stands now, economically and socially many mothers feel pressured to work.

Economic and social incentives for mothers who want to be at home would at last present women with a fair balance of opportunity—the first genuine choice they have had in a long time.

Thank you.

Chairman **MILLER**. Thank you very much.

[Prepared statement of Linda Burton follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LINDA BURTON, SPRINGFIELD, VA

My name is Linda Burton. I live in Springfield, Virginia. I am accompanied by Cheri Loveless of Vienna, Virginia. Along with another Vienna resident, Janet Dittmer, we are founders of Mothers At Home, a support organization for mothers who choose to stay home. Our monthly publication, WELCOME HOME, which began distribution only three months ago, has subscribers in fifty states and two foreign countries.

Less than six months ago, we began speaking out on the subject of mothers who choose not to enter the paid workforce while their children need them at home. When our statements were made public, women across the nation responded immediately in extraordinary numbers. We heard from mothers in urban areas and mothers in rural areas, mothers who call themselves liberals and mothers who consider themselves conservative, mothers of preschoolers and mothers of teens, mothers who have never worked outside the home and mothers who work full time. Until statistics are compiled, we cannot state what percentage each of these categories represents of our total response. However, it is clear that the mothers writing to us cross all political, religious, and socio-economic lines, with no particular group the obvious majority.

We wish to point out that our group, Mothers At Home, is not political. We do not lobby on behalf of any political party or organization. However, we are happy to play an educational role, and it is in that capacity that we appear here today.

MORE EQUALITY DAY CARE MAY NOT BE POSSIBLE

Everywhere, there are demands for "more quality day care." The report you printed in December 1983, on the demographic and social trends affecting care for dependents, indicates that an already critical problem is going to get much worse. At this time most efforts to solve the nation's massive child-care problems center around discovering ways to create more day care and ways to upgrade the quality of that care. Based on the information coming to us in the form of letters and phonecalls from mothers of all backgrounds and circumstances, we strongly suggest that another approach to the problem be investigated—that of bringing home the many mothers who do work who would rather not be in the paid labor force, who would rather not have their children in day care in the first place. These mothers, who work only because of economic and social pressures, could be given incentives to remain home with their children. Taking their children out of day care would make more care available to the mothers who still choose to work.

Mothers who do require day care for their children clearly must have access to the best care available. But they are not going to get it from an over-burdened child-care system. Seldom do "more" and "quality" go hand in hand, and in the case of an issue so deeply human as child care, this is particularly so. We cannot legislate or exercise quality controls over the capacity of one human being to love and care for another. If the child care experiences we hear about from many former and current working mothers is an accurate indication of the kind of child care most mothers are finding, then perhaps the attempt to create more day care merely hits the symptom rather than the root of the problem.

Our mail indicates that many mothers are working simply to provide economic stability for their families, and that they view day care as a necessary evil rather than as an acceptable alternative.

A mother from Fairfax, Virginia, writes, "You are quite right when you state there is little else besides money drawing mothers to salaried jobs. I work with large numbers of such women both in my 9–5 job and in my volunteer work as Director of the Women's Center." A working mother in Allentown, Pennsylvania, shares her feelings this way: "I'm a working mother, albeit a very, very reluctant one. My daughter will be six months old tomorrow and not a day goes by without me grieving over losing these precious days with her. I have to work, but my husband and I are doing everything possible to get ourselves on our feet financially so I can work part time by autum."

POOR IMAGE OF MOTHERHOOD MEANS POOR QUALITY CHILD CARE

More subtle than economic pressures to work, but possibly more of an influence on the state of child care in the nation, is the social pressure mothers feel. In the past twenty years, we have fostered a generation of young people who have heard nothing but put-downs about child-rearing. They have been massively encouraged to "do something more important" with their lives. Mothering has no prestige. While we as a nation continue to respect motherhood, we have little respect for its mothers. The mothers our organization has heard from believe they are considered intellectually inferior and out of pace with the times. They also feel dismissed as self-indulgent, lazy people whose job could be easily replaced by an institution.

A typical mother from Sacramento, California, writes, "I am so tired of certain people looking down on me because I am 'only a housewife.' Even my husband, who supports my decision to remain at home, thinks I do practically nothing all day long. People seem to think that a woman who stays home with her child is not quite bright, that she has nothing important to say." Another woman, this one from Destrehan, Louisiana, comments, "I have often jokingly thought that there should be a Homebodies Anonymous, wherein all of the members admit, 'I am a mother-at-home. I am embarrassed to admit that I no longer hold a professional title.' I have long been, and still am, an avid supporter of NOW, but admit to confusion as to my role since I quit working. I hold a degree in Mathematics and was the Dean of Academics at a private school. Somehow, I feel a need to tell people of my past accomplishments, certain that they would think me dull were I to tell them of the joys of being a mother-homemaker."

From Dale, Texas, the wife of a CPA writes, "The pressure from our society makes us feel that if we don't work outside the home, we can do nothing else." A mother from New Jersey who does volunteer work with child abusers explains, "Low housewife image and isolation are at the top of the list for unhappy mothers—and therefore child neglect or abuse." A working mother from Rochester, New York, writes, "I am not at home, but would like to be. It is a shame that I was brainwashed while in college into thinking I must work outside the home."

When it becomes increasingly evident that the business of raising children is beneath the national dignity, then intelligent, skilled, compassionate people are not likely to want the job. Nor are they likely to want to staff day care centers to take care of other people's children.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Our correspondence from mothers across the nation, strongly indicates that the establishment of economic incentives and social sanctions for those who prefer to raise their own children at home, would have an impact. We run a risk in suggesting specific measures, because we feel that single suggestions can too easily be shot down as impractical—thus damaging the larger proposition. Therefore, we will cite some examples, which should be treated as a springboard for further discussion.

Father William Byron, President of Washington, D.C.'s Catholic University has suggested mothers be accorded social credits for each year they remain home, which would be redeemable as either higher education for their children of Civil Service points for themselves. A mother who wrote to us from Newman, California, lists several suggestions. Among them are: a significant tax break for mothers who do not work outside the home, the establishment of Social Security benefits for homemaker, and the right to put into an IRA the same amount allowed her working spouse.

Benefits similar to those given veterans, such as special mortgage packages and special loans, would aid mothers like one who writes us from Baltimore, Maryland: "All I have ever wanted to be, since the age of 13, is a mother at home. At 37, I expected to be settled down with two or three kids living the American Dream, but such is not the case. Within the first year of our daughter's life, my husband went into a deep depression. We lost our house because my husband wouldn't/couldn't keep up the payments. I received and receive no child care, but I was determined to stay with my daughter for whom I had waited so long. With the help of my father-in-law, I got a lease on a work processor, and for almost three years I have been working from my home, and taking care of my daughter. But the business will not survive unless I can expand, and I can't get any credit or find an investor. I don't want to leave home."

Certainly the government could take the lead in recognizing the skills a woman develops as a homemaker when considering past mothers at home for jobs. A Woodbridge, Virginia, mother writes, "At one time I worked for the Astronaut Affairs Office with NASA Headquarters in Washington, D.C. It was a very glamorous job; I met many astronauts; scheduled lunar samples all over the world and I loved it. But, my 'job' as a homemaker is much more demanding and requires good management skills, not only in management of people but resources and time as well."

Perhaps incentives could also be given to the private sector to encourage exploration of innovative ways to aid mothers who want to be home with their children but cannot for financial reasons. We have heard about a college which "frees" its "mother employees" over the summer months to allow them to be with their children while college students fill in for them. In the fall, when children have returned to school, the mothers are welcomed back to their full time positions. Perhaps some businesses would see fit to issue special discount cards or to offer other special treatment such as servicemen and senior citizens are given.

These are some measures that have been suggested by the people who write to us. Some of these measures may work. None of them may work. Or variations of a few times of them in concert may work. We are not here to tell you precisely what measures should be taken. We are here to tell you that thousands of mothers working both inside and outside the home want desperately to raise their own children. If you help them find a way to do that, both working mothers and mothers at home will benefit. It would greatly improve the quality of existing day care by forcing the removal of the "chaff" from our obviously overburdened child-care system. It would vastly enhance the overall quality of child-care in this country by ensuring that a great many more children would receive the full time individual nurturing that they deserve.

Finally, economic relief and social sanction for mothers at home would be a strong endorsement of the advocacy of choice—the belief that women should be able to choose what they want to do with their lives. As it stands now, economically and socially, many mothers feel pressured to work. Economic and social incentives for mothers who want to be at home would at last present women with a fair balance of opportunity—the first genuine "choice" they've had in a long time.

Chairman MILLER. Mrs. Hughes, your testimony suggests that one of the components of a day care policy should allow for center-based case.

Ms. HUGHES. For infants.

Chairman MILLER. For infants. And you seem to be relying, first on your own experience at UCLA and second on your belief that such care allows for better socialization for children than home care, if a nonfamily member comes into the home for purposes of care.

Ms. HUGHES. The socialization issue I think has to do with the fact that on center-based care you have more children and a higher staffing ratio and the staff is professional in that they are trained in early childhood education.

The two alternatives that are open to mothers in Montgomery County, where I reside now, are family day care, which has a staffing ratio much higher than you get in center-based care, or in-home care, where a child is basically in-home with a provider and not interacting with other children, unless the provider takes them outside to interact with other children on the block—and in the neighborhood I live in I am the only one with a small child.

Chairman **MILLER**. Ms. Yeamans, an issue raised earlier I know is being raised in areas of California, and that has to do with zoning restrictions. In Montgomery County, in terms of providers setting up family day care homes or other day care centers, is zoning a problem?

Ms. **YEAMANS**. I am not really aware of a zoning problem relative to the day care. I do not know that. I can check on that for you and return it in writing to you.

Chairman **MILLER**. I would appreciate that.

[The information referred to follows:]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Zoning Text Amendment No. 82014

Introduced: June 22, 1982
Adopted Summer 1982

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE TEXT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE FOR THE MARYLAND-WASHINGTON REGIONAL DISTRICT IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

By: Councilmember Spector

AN AMENDMENT to Division 59-C-1, title "Residential Zone, One-Family," Section 59-C-1.3, title "Land Uses;" Division 59-C-2, title "Residential Zone, Multiple-Family," Section 59-C-2.3, title "Land Uses;" Division 59-C-4, title "Commercial Zones," Section 59-C-4.0, title "Land Uses;" Division 59-C-5, title "Industrial Zones," Section 59-C-5.2, title "Land Uses;" and Division 59-G-2, title "Special Exceptions - Standards and Requirements," Section 59-G-2.13, title "Child or Elderly Care Facilities for more than 4 Individuals;" to increase from 4 to 6 the number of children who may be served by a child day care facility in the residential zones, to conform special exception requirements, and to allow child day care facilities as permitted uses in the Commercial and Industrial Zones.

BE IT ORDAINED by the County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland, sitting as the District Council for the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Montgomery County, Maryland, that -

Sec. 1. Division 59-C-1, title "Residential Zone, One-Family," Section 59-C-1.3, title "Land Uses," is hereby amended as follows:

	RE-2	RE-2C	RE-1	R-200	R-150	R-90	R-60	R-40	R-4 Plex	RMH-200
Services										
• • •										
Child ~~or elderly~~ day care facilities for not more than ~~4~~ 6 individuals	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Child ~~or elderly~~ day care facilities for more than ~~4~~ 6 individuals	SE	SE	SE	SE	SE	SE	SE	SE	SE	SE
• • •										
Elderly day care facilities for not more than 4 (4) individuals	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Elderly day care facilities for more than 4 (4)	SE	SE	SE	SE	SE	SE	SE	SE	SE	SE
• • •										

---

(4) Definition and special exception standards located under "Child or Elderly Day Care Facility."

Sec. 2. Division 59-C-2, title "Residential Zone, Multiple-Family," Section 59-C-2.3, title "Land Uses," is hereby amended as follows:

Services	R-30	R-20	R-10	R-H
• • •				
Child ~~or elderly~~ day care facilities for up to ~~4~~ 6 individuals	P	P	P	P
Child ~~or elderly~~ day care facilities for more than ~~4~~ 6 individuals	SE	SE	SE	SE
Elderly day care facilities for up to 4 individuals (3)	P	P	P	P
Elderly day care facilities for more than 4 individuals (3)	SE	SE	SE	SE
• • •				

• • •

(3) Definition and special exception standards located under "Child or Elderly Day Care Facilities."

Sec. 3. Division 59-C-4, title "Commercial Zones," Section 59-C-4.0, title "Land Uses," is hereby amended as follows:

	C-T	O-M	C-O	C-P	C-1	C-2	C-3	H-M	Country Inn
Services									
• • •									
Child day care facilities	~~SE~~ P	~~SE~~ P	~~SE~~ P		~~SE~~ P	~~SE~~ P			
• • •									

Sec. 4. Division 59-C-5, title "Industrial Zones," Section 59-C-5.2, title "Land Uses," is hereby amended as follows:

	I-1	I-2	I-3
Services			
• • •			
Child day care facilities	~~SE~~ P	~~SE~~ P	~~SE~~ P
• • •			

Sec. 5. Division 59-G-2, title "Special Exceptions - Standards and Regulations," Section 59-G-2.13, title "Child or elderly day care facilities for more than 4 individuals," is hereby amended, as follows:

59-G-2.13 Child or elderly care facilities ~~for more than 4 individuals~~

a) A child or elderly day care facility or center for up to forty individuals may be allowed, upon a finding by the Board:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(1) That such use will not constitute a nuisance because of traffic, insufficient parking, number of individuals being cared for, noise or type of physical activity; and

(2) That, if a child care facility, there is amply indoor and outdoor play space, free from hazard, appropriately equipped for the age and number of children cared for, and readily accessible.

(b) A child or elderly day care facility or center for more than forty individuals may be allowed, upon a finding by the Board:

(1) That such use will not constitute a nuisance because of traffic, insufficient parking, number of individuals being cared for, noise or type of physical activity; and

(2) That, if a child care facility, there is ample indoor and outdoor play space free from hazard, appropriately equipped for the age and number of children being cared for, and readily accessible; and

(3) That, if a child care facility, the area of the property contains no less than one thousand square feet per child being cared for.

(c) The requirements of this section shall not apply to child or elderly day care facilities or centers which are operated by a nonprofit organization in buildings, structures or on premises owned or leased by a religious organization and which premises are regularly used as a place of worship, or are located on premises owned or leased by a religious organization adjacent to premises regularly used as a place of worship, or are used for private parochial educational purposes which are exempted under the provisions of this section for private educational institutions or are located in publicly owned school buildings.

Sec. 6. This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon adoption.

EXPLANATIONS: Underlining indicates text to be added.

~~Dashes~~ indicate text to be deleted.

A True Copy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chairman **Miller**. Ms. Burton, I am not quite clear on one point. I understand the need to support women who desire to stay at home. What I am not quite clear on is what you are suggesting for the women who must work out of economic necessity.

Ms. **Burton**. We are suggesting that by the sort of support for mothers at home, mothers who must work out of an economic necessity will receive much better day care than they now have. The good care will become available, we think.

Chairman **Miller**. I do not understand. I am sorry I do not follow that line of reasoning.

Ms. **Burton**. When there is less of a demand for day care, when a lot of the children are taken out of the day care system, the care that is abysmal—and it is clear that there is a lot of it—is going to fall by the wayside. The good care, people are going to have more access to care.

I tried to find child care in this country for 2 years that I was happy with, and I did not find anything. That care is out there, but it is out there in finite amounts.

Mr. **Marriott**. Would the gentleman yield?

Chairman **Miller**. Yes.

Mr. **Marriott**. If I understand what you are saying—let me just make sure I get this right down to the bottom line here—I do not think I totally disagree with what you are saying. But, are you saying that people like Mrs. Hughes who's husband is a doctor, and you are a professional person—should be limited on child care facilities so that we make room for those who have to work out of economic necessity?

Ms. **Burton**. No, that is not what I am saying. Why don't I ask Cheri Loveless to continue. She is the president of Mothers At Home. She has not had a chance to speak yet.

Ms. **Loveless**. That means Linda does not want to answer it.

Mr. **Marriott**. I do not want to cause any fistfights on the panel; I just want to make sure I understand what you are saying.

Ms. **Loveless**. We have been publishing a newsletter for mothers at home and we got a reaction. You must understand we have only been distributing this for 3 months. We have heard from over 3,100 people, most of them mothers at home and working mothers. But a surprising number of people are writing and telling us that they are working mothers and that they do not want to be working mothers, that they want to be home with their children.

Mr. **Marriott**. Why are they not?

Ms. **Loveless**. They are not home because financially they cannot handle it, and some socially cannot handle it. They feel they are the only people left on the block. They feel a lot of pressure, isolation, no one supporting them. Everywhere they go people tell them that what they are doing is worthless or giving them some suggestion that it is worthless, and because of this a lot of them go back to work.

Many of these women, if they felt like it was socially acceptable to stay home with their children and if they felt like they had economic incentives, there was something that made a difference in the budget, they would stay home, and this would pull a lot of children out of the present child care system, which would free the remaining child care, the good child care I would hope, for the women that you have heard from today.

Mr. MARRIOTT. So the bottom line of what you are saying is that we should promote the idea that homemaking and motherhood and parents in the home is a good, positive social thing, and then by promoting that we would encourage more women to stay home, thus freeing up more day care slots. Is that the bottom line?

Ms. BURTON. And that it should become economically feasible, more feasible than it is now for a lot of people.

Mr. MARRIOTT. So you think there is a psychological barrier?

Ms. BURTON. And economic.

Mr. MARRIOTT. And you are not suggesting we put a lid on day care centers by income or some other criteria?

Ms. LOVELESS. Oh, no, not at all. I am sorry if there is something that indicated that.

Chairman MILLER. I appreciate Congressman's Marriott's question because I did not quite understand how these slots were going to become available. It is not a new idea in America. We pay farmers not to work. We could pay women not to work and they could stay home.

Ms. BURTON. Women do work at home. They work very hard at home.

Chairman MILLER. I understand that, but we do not have a policy that really responds to their needs for care when they have to go to work.

I think Congressman Wolf has raised the issue of the standard deduction, which has obviously not kept up with inflation and would allow people with income to keep more of it. But I will be interested in hearing how your readers respond to the issue of economic necessity.

And not to put down people who make a choice to work, I think we ought to understand it cuts both ways. You can make a choice to stay home and you can make a choice to work and recognize the individual in that determination. But what concerns us as we look at family incomes, if you look at the breakdown by the IRS and Census Bureau, you are looking at huge numbers of families in this country, many with two income earners, who are still the working poor because of the kind of employment they have.

I think we have got to continue to address that.

Congressman Marriott.

Mr. MARRIOTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would just like to make a point, Linda, that I agree with some of the things you have said—that no institution or day care center can replace the mother. I believe that is obvious and everybody agrees with that. And I, for one, think that maybe some mothers work who should not work and they ought to get their priorities straight, but again it is not for me to decide what their priorities are.

One thing I am trying to push—and I would like to have everybody on the panel discuss this issue—and that is, is there enough in-home work potential for parents who want to work at home? For example, there is some discussion that as we enter the computer age workers who traditionally went down to the office to do their duty, go to lunch and take their two breaks and then go home, may not be any more productive than if you could have people doing more of that kind of work in their homes—that is, prepare for the possibility where a working mother or professional person could indeed do work at home for the employer and get more time at home with the children doing the job at the same time.

Do any of you think there is any possibility of making that type of a thing work as we now move into the computer age?

Ms. YEAMANS. I certainly think that is another option to throw into this pot for the working mother, another choice, for the at-home mother, and I think it needs to be looked at. I think there is a question in New England, is there not, of whether women can stay home and knit. Extend it: Can they stay home and computerize?

The other part of the issue is that not all of us are going to stay home and computerize. Many of us do need to do work with human beings and we would not have that option (to work at home), but I do think it is another option that we probably need to address.

Mr. MARRIOTT. Mrs. Hughes, you are a professional person. I think you have adjusted your schedule with your husband's. What do you think about the possibilities of doing more of what you do?

Ms. HUGHES. I think by choosing an academic profession it put me in a unique position in that I could meet my child care needs if my daughter was sick and I could schedule my classes accordingly. I could be home with her. And I think that is an important decision that we made in the choice of choosing what we were going to do.

I think the options of being able to work at home are very important for some mothers because I think that they do feel a certain question of whether they are providing the quantity and quality of care they should, and having the ability to stay home and satisfy their needs and that of their children.

But I do not think that you necessarily can look at it as the only alternative. I think that we have to keep a wide array of alternatives open because mothers have different needs.

Mr. MARRIOTT. Do you want to comment on that?

Ms. LOVELESS. Certainly this is an alternative. There seems to be another stereotype, which is that the women that stays home do nothing but tend the children all day. I think most of the mothers who are home do earn some kind of income at home, either on a part-time basis or, you know, going out a couple of days a week, a nurse going out on a night shift, something like this, or they work in their homes, or they are at least keeping up skills in volunteer work that they can use on a résumé later when they go back in the work force.

So I would say already this is something that people show a preference for. I would like to see a lot more support for that.

Mr. MARRIOTT. One more last question, Mrs. Yeamans, if I may. The day care centers that you are involved in, you take some children just before school, some all day, some only after school?

Ms. YEAMANS. All of the above.

Mr. MARRIOTT. Is that right?

Ms. YEAMANS. We do.

Mr. MARRIOTT. If I wanted to partake of your services, how much does it cost now? If I were to put a child in preschool and then have him come to your school before he starts school and after school until I get home from work, how much does that cost me a month now?

Ms. **YEAMANS**. This again would vary from center to center, particularly under the umbrella of Montgomery County Child Day Care. I would guess the average per week for before and after school care, elementary age child, grade one to five, is approximately $70 a week.

Mr. **MARRIOTT**. Now if I went all day—if I was a working parent and put my young child in there at age 3 and then picked him up at 6 at night, what would that cost?

Ms. **YEAMANS**. I do not have those particular preschool fees because my particular area of focus happens to be school age.

Mr. **MARRIOTT**. Can you just give us a ballpark?

Ms. **YEAMANS**. I cannot, but again I would be happy to send you a breakdown of those fees, as they change from center to center.

OLNEY, MD
June 8, 1984.

Congressman GEORGE MILLER,
Chairman, House of Representatives Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLER: Enclosed is my corrected testimony delayed considerably because of family illness in Ohio.

Information regarding Montgomery County zoning regulations pertaining to family day care was requested following my testimony. I advised Mrs. Millie Grant, Montgomery County Department of Family Resources, to mail them directly to the Committee office.

Rates for care of pre-school aged children in centers under the umbrella of Montgomery Child Day Care Association (MCDCA) approximate $287 per child per month or $66 per child per week. This full day care of 10½-11½ hours per day includes breakfast, lunch, and two snacks.

Rates for care of school-aged children in MCDCA centers approximates $191 per child per month or $44 per child per week. This before and after school care for children in first thru fifth grades is usually available 7 a.m.-9 a.m. and 3 p.m.-6 p.m. and includes breakfast and one snack. Full day coverage extends on snow days, school half-days, and school holidays and includes lunch and an additional a.m. snack as is appropriate.

Again, thank you for the opportunity of testifying before the Select Committee.

Sincerely,

ANN F. YEAMANS.

Mr. **MARRIOTT**. Mr. Chairman, could we hold the record open for additional testimony from all these witnesses for a day or two?

Chairman **MILLER**. Sure. Let me just add, since you raise the point, I would like to ask the committee to enter into the record the standard deduction and its relationship to inflation.

[The information referred to follows:]

[From the Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress—84-737 E]

PERSONAL AND DEPENDENT EXEMPTIONS: DISTRIBUTION OF THE EXEMPTION FOR CHILDREN BY ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME CLASS, TAX YEAR 1981

(By Stacey M. Kean, Analyst in Government Finance, Economics Division)

ABSTRACT

The Federal income tax code provides for personal and dependent exemptions which serve to reduce the taxable income of the taxpayer. The personal and dependent exemption is fixed at a level of $1,000 currently and is scheduled to increase in 1985, when it will be indexed for inflation. There have been proposals to change the amount of the personal and dependent exemption. This report decribes the total number of exemptions and the number of exemptions for children by adjusted gross income class.

The Federal income tax code provides for personal and dependent exemptions which serve to reduce the taxable income of the taxpayer. The personal and dependent exemption is fixed at a level of $1,000 currently and is scheduled to increase in 1985 when it will be indexed for inflation. There have been proposals to change the amount of the personal and dependent exemption. This report describes the total number of exemptions and the number of exemptions for children by adjusted gross income class.

Personal exemptions have four major functions:

1. Keeping the total number of returns within manageable proportions and particularly holding down the number with tax liability less than the cost of collection;
2. Freeing from the tax the income needed to maintain a minimum standard of living;
3. Helping achieve a smooth graduation of effective tax rates at the lower end of the scale; and
4. Differentiation of tax liability according to family size.[1]

The personal and dependent exemption and the zero bracket amount (formerly the standard deduction) provide a minimum level, below which income is not taxed. Taxation below this minimum income level could reduce "health and efficiency and result(s) in lower economic vitality, less production, and possibly higher public expenditues for social welfare programs."[2]

The Federal Tax Code provides for personal and dependent exemptions in several categories. There are exemptions for taxpayers, exemptions for age 65 or over, exemptions for blindness, and exemptions for dependents. Exemptions for dependents include exemptions for children, both at home and away from home; exemptions for parents, and exemptions for other dependents. Table 1 lists the types of exemptions and their share of total exemptions.

TABLE 1.—*Types of personal and dependent exemptions as a percent of all exemptions, tax year 1981*

Type of exemption	*Percent of all exemptions*
Taxpayers	61.05
65 or older	5.67
Blindness	.10
Dependents	33.18
Children	31.60
At Home	30.60
Away From Home	1.00
Parents	0.71
Other Dependents	0.88
Total	100.00

Source: Calculated by CRS using U.S. Department of the Treasury. Internal Revenue Service. 1981 Statistics of Income. Individual Income Tax Returns. Table 23.

After exemptions for taxpayers themselves (includes taxpayer and taxpayer's spouse), exemptions for children are the largest percentage of personal and dependent exemptions. Thirty-nine percent of all returns list exemptions for children. Table 2 lists the total number of exemptions claimed on Federal tax returns, the number of exemptions for children, and the number of exemptions for children as a percent of all exemptions by adjusted gross income class for tax year 1981. The number of exemptions for children as a percent of total exemptions for each adjusted gross income class was 31.6 percent, ranging from a low of 14.9 percent for the adjusted gross income class of $1 under $1,000, to a high of 38.5 percent for those with adjusted gross income (AGI) between $30,000 and $40,000. Exemptions for children were a steadily increasing portion of all exemptions through the $30,000 to $40,000 level of AGI. After this adjusted gross income class, the number of exemptions for children as a percent of all exemptions declined to 27.5 percent at an AGI of $1 million or more. Summarizing the results over wider adjusted gross income classes, the number of exemptions for children as a percentage of all exemptions steadily increased from 18.8 percent for those with AGI under $5,000 to 37.5 percent to those with AGI over $20,000. These data are summarized at the bottom of table 2.

---

[1] Goode, Richard. The Individual Income Tax. Washington, The Brookings Institution, 1964, pp. 224-225.

[2] Pechman, Joseph A. Federal Tax Policy. Washington, The Brookings Institution, 1983 p. 78.

Table 3 provides data on the percent distribution of total exemptions for children by adjusted gross income class. In tax year 1981, 7.34 percent of the exemptions for children were claimed on tax returns with adjusted gross incomes below $5,000. Taxpayers in the adjusted gross income class between $5,000 and $10,000 claimed 12.40 percent of the exemptions for children. Taxpayers in the adjusted gross income classes between $10,000 and $15,000, claimed 12.85 percent of the exemptions for children. Taxpayers in the adjusted gross income classes between $15,000 and $20,000 claimed 12.75 percent of the exemptions for children. And, finally, taxpayers in the adjusted gross income classes over $20,000 claimed 54.66 percent of the exemptions for children.

TABLE 2.—TOTAL PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS AND EXEMPTIONS FOR CHILDREN, TAX YEAR 1981

Size of adjusted gross income	All exemptions [1]		Exemptions for children [2]		
	Number of returns	Number of exemptions	Number of returns	Number of children	As a percent of total exemptions [3]
Total	95,396,123	231,222,374	37,326,457	73,053,973	31.6
$1 under $1,000	2,675,489	3,541,512	301,346	529,413	14.9
$1,000 under $2,000	3,941,113	5,219,266	490,778	817,084	15.7
$2,000 under $3,000	3,914,658	5,604,383	526,792	962,486	17.2
$3,000 under $4,000	3,767,056	5,838,331	641,102	1,114,515	19.1
$4,000 under $5,000	3,638,815	6,162,753	734,416	1,265,218	20.5
$5,000 under $6,000	3,682,533	6,912,451	898,749	1,620,285	23.4
$6,000 under $7,000	3,569,408	6,861,659	898,405	1,611,695	23.5
$7,000 under $8,000	3,719,113	7,620,123	1,026,639	1,959,057	25.7
$8,000 under $9,000	3,347,407	7,074,622	993,648	1,813,239	25.6
$9,000 under $10,000	3,332,417	7,329,281	1,046,769	2,052,322	28.0
$10,000 under $11,000	3,181,727	6,918,307	994,248	1,925,271	27.8
$11,000 under $12,000	3,018,829	6,703,280	1,010,919	1,950,138	29.1
$12,000 under $13,000	2,802,404	6,377,317	927,701	1,785,827	28.0
$13,000 under $14,000	2,702,730	6,163,485	965,306	1,835,060	29.8
$14,000 under $15,000	2,487,470	6,015,535	992,445	1,893,106	31.5
$15,000 under $16,000	2,404,032	5,922,983	956,874	1,857,110	31.4
$16,000 under $17,000	2,244,954	5,649,507	964,606	1,828,282	32.4
$17,000 under $18,000	2,223,470	5,853,747	999,270	1,933,075	33.0
$18,000 under $19,000	2,068,087	5,394,708	900,085	1,771,971	32.8
$19,000 under $20,000	2,057,651	5,582,523	973,072	1,924,177	34.5
$20,000 under $25,000	9,117,136	26,041,614	4,761,935	9,425,999	36.2
$25,000 under $30,000	7,205,282	22,412,481	4,196,108	8,531,265	38.1
$30,000 under $40,000	9,205,336	30,122,224	5,714,849	11,598,414	38.5
$40,000 under $50,000	4,182,389	13,871,459	2,605,275	5,265,183	38.0
$50,000 under $75,000	2,796,836	9,403,559	1,717,990	3,474,346	36.9
$75,000 under $100,000	645,884	2,219,966	386,857	814,810	36.7
$100,000 under $200,000	516,516	1,811,433	303,113	663,327	36.6
$200,000 under $500,000	118,092	411,639	63,419	139,342	33.9
$500,000 under $1,000,000	14,758	49,427	6,791	14,603	29.5
$1,000,000 or more	5,286	17,413	2,211	4,795	27.5
All returns summary:					
Under $5,000	18,746,376	28,481,431	3,019,273	5,361,274	18.8
$5,000 under $10,000	17,650,878	35,798,136	4,864,210	9,056,598	25.3
$10,000 under $15,000	14,193,160	32,178,124	4,890,619	9,389,402	29.2
$15,000 under $20,000	10,998,194	28,403,468	4,793,807	9,314,615	32.8
$20,000 or more	33,807,515	106,361,215	19,758,548	39,932,084	37.5

---

[1] All exemptions include exemptions for taxpayers, exemptions for age 65 or over, exemptions for blindness, and exemptions for dependents including children, parents, and other dependents.

[2] Includes both exemptions for children at home and exemptions for children away from home.

[3] Calculated by CRS.

Source: U.S. Department of the Treasury. Internal Revenue Service. Statistics of Income 1981. Individual Income Tax Returns. Table 2.3.

TABLE 2.—TOTAL PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS AND EXEMPTIONS FOR CHILDREN, TAX YEAR 1981

Size of adjusted gross income	All exemptions [1]		Exemptions for children [2]		
	Number of returns	Number of exemptions	Number of returns	Number of children	As a percent of total exemptions [3]
Total	95,396,123	231,222,374	37,326,457	73,053,973	31.6
$1 under $1,000	2,675,489	3,541,512	301,346	529,413	14.9
$1,000 under $2,000	3,941,113	5,219,266	490,778	817,084	15.7
$2,000 under $3,000	3,914,658	5,604,383	526,792	962,486	17.2
$3,000 under $4,000	3,767,056	5,838,331	641,102	1,114,515	19.1
$4,000 under $5,000	3,638,815	6,162,753	734,416	1,265,218	20.5
$5,000 under $6,000	3,682,533	6,912,451	898,749	1,620,285	23.4
$6,000 under $7,000	3,569,408	6,861,659	898,405	1,611,695	23.5
$7,000 under $8,000	3,719,113	7,620,123	1,026,639	1,959,057	25.7
$8,000 under $9,000	3,347,407	7,074,622	993,648	1,813,239	25.6
$9,000 under $10,000	3,332,417	7,329,281	1,046,769	2,052,322	28.0
$10,000 under $11,000	3,181,727	6,918,307	994,248	1,925,271	27.8
$11,000 under $12,000	3,018,829	6,703,280	1,010,919	1,950,138	29.1
$12,000 under $13,000	2,802,404	6,377,317	927,701	1,785,827	28.0
$13,000 under $14,000	2,702,730	6,163,485	965,306	1,835,060	29.8
$14,000 under $15,000	2,487,470	6,015,535	992,445	1,893,106	31.5
$15,000 under $16,000	2,404,032	5,922,983	956,874	1,857,110	31.4
$16,000 under $17,000	2,244,954	5,649,507	964,606	1,828,282	32.4
$17,000 under $18,000	2,223,470	5,853,747	999,270	1,933,075	33.0
$18,000 under $19,000	2,068,087	5,394,708	900,085	1,771,971	32.8
$19,000 under $20,000	2,057,651	5,582,523	973,072	1,924,177	34.5
$20,000 under $25,000	9,117,136	26,041,614	4,761,935	9,425,999	36.2
$25,000 under $30,000	7,205,282	22,412,481	4,196,108	8,531,265	38.1
$30,000 under $40,000	9,205,336	30,122,224	5,714,849	11,598,414	38.5
$40,000 under $50,000	4,182,389	13,871,459	2,605,275	5,265,183	38.0
$50,000 under $75,000	2,796,836	9,403,559	1,717,990	3,474,346	36.9
$75,000 under $100,000	645,884	2,219,966	386,857	814,810	36.7
$100,000 under $200,000	516,516	1,811,433	303,113	663,327	36.6
$200,000 under $500,000	118,092	411,639	63,419	139,342	33.9
$500,000 under $1,000,000	14,758	49,427	6,791	14,603	29.5
$1,000,000 or more	5,286	17,413	2,211	4,795	27.5
All returns summary:					
Under $5,000	18,746,376	28,481,431	3,019,273	5,361,274	18.8
$5,000 under $10,000	17,650,878	35,798,136	4,864,210	9,056,598	25.3
$10,000 under $15,000	14,193,160	32,178,124	4,890,619	9,389,402	29.2
$15,000 under $20,000	10,998,194	28,403,468	4,793,807	9,314,615	32.8
$20,000 or more	33,807,515	106,361,215	19,758,548	39,932,084	37.5

---

[1] All exemptions include exemptions for taxpayers, exemptions for age 65 or over, exemptions for blindness, and exemptions for dependents including children, parents, and other dependents.

[2] Includes both exemptions for children at home and exemptions for children away from home.

[3] Calculated by CRS.

Source: U.S. Department of the Treasury. Internal Revenue Service. Statistics of Income 1981. Individual Income Tax Returns. Table 2.3.

TABLE 3.—*Percent distribution of total exemptions for children by adjusted gross income class, tax year 1981*

Size of adjusted gross income	*Percent distribution of total exemptions for children*
Total	$100.00
$1 under $1,000	0.72
$1,000 under $2,000	1.12
$2,000 under $3,000	1.32
$3,000 under $4,000	1.53
$4,000 under $5,000	1.73
$5,000 under $6,000	2.22

Size of adjusted gross income	*Percent distribution of total exemptions for children*
$6,000 under $7,000	2.21
$7,000 under $8,000	2.68
$8,000 under $9,000	2.48
$9,000 under $10,000	2.81
$10,000 under $11,000	2.64
$11,000 under $12,000	2.67
$12,000 under $13,000	2.44
$13,000 under $14,000	2.51
$14,000 under $15,000	2.59
$15,000 under $16,000	2.54
$16,000 under $17,000	2.50
$17,000 under $18,000	2.65
$18,000 under $19,000	2.43
$19,000 under $20,000	2.63
$20,000 under $25,000	12.90
$25,000 under $30,000	11.68
$30,000 under $40,000	15.88
$40,000 under $50,000	7.21
$50,000 under $75,000	4.76
$75,000 under $100,000	1.12
$100,000 under $200,000	0.91
$200,000 under $500,000	0.19
$500,000 under $1,000,000	0.02
$1,000,000 or more	0.01
All returns summary	100.00
Under $5,000	7.34
$5,000 under $10,000	12.40
$10,000 under $15,000	12.85
$15,000 under $20,000	12.75
$20,000 or more	54.66

Source: Calculated by CRS using data from table 2.

Increasing the personal and dependent exemption

President Reagan has suggested that one of the tax reform proposals that may be sent to the Congress in 1985 would be a proposal for a $1,000 increase in the personal exemption. An increase of this type would reduce the tax base by setting aside a certain amount of income that would be tax-free. The Treasury has estimated that an increase of $1,000 in both the personal and dependent exemption would reduce Federal tax revenues by $40 billion annually.

CRS has estimated a similar revenue loss. The following is an explanation of how the estimate was made.

According to the Internal Revenue Service "Statistics of Income Bulletin" (Winter, 1983-1984), 233 million personal exemptions were claimed on returns in 1982. An increase of personal exemptions in the amount of $1,000 would increase exemptions claimed by $233 billion. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation "Background and Issues Relating to Individual Income Tax Reductions," prepared for the Committee on Ways and Means, April 27, 1981), the average marginal tax rate in 1981 was 32.2 percent. This marginal tax rate was reduced by subsequent tax reductions, but these were largely offset by inflation. Thus, a tax rate in the neighborhood of 30 percent seems appropriate. In the case of the personal exemption, however, this marginal tax rate is too high because it is weighted by income rather than returns. Since a flat increase is being provided across the board, a marginal tax rate weighted by returns would be more appropriate. Using data provided in that committee print, we estimated a rough marginal effective tax rate of about 20 percent. The revenue loss estimated from the personal exemption would be $47 billion (0.2 times $233 billion), for 1982 population levels.[3]

Besides the Federal revenue loss, there are two important points that should be considered in evaluating the impact of this increase in the personal and dependent exemptions. Under a progressive tax system, the tax value of any deduction or exclusion increases as the marginal tax rates increase. While it does increase the level of tax-free income and thereby reduce tax liabilities, it does this for all taxpayers and not only for those at the lower end of the tax rate schedule.

---

[3] Gravelle, Jane G. Revenue Effects of Certain Tax Revisions. CRS Memorandum. August 16, 1984, 2 pages.

The second point that should be considered is that only those who pay tax could benefit from either the personal and dependent exemption or an increase of $1,000 in the exemption. Persons and families with income so low that they are not subject to taxes or who do not file tax returns would not benefit from the personal and dependent exemption.

Mr. **Marriott**. Just finally, I know my time is up, but I am interested in finding out the exact costs for these services, for quality services and also—I just lost my train of thought, Mr. Chairman. You were looking at me and I forgot what was the question. [Laughter.]

Chairman **Miller**. Mr. Wolf.

Mr. **Wolf**. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

If the standard deduction had kept pace with inflation it would be $4,600 and it is not that, and I would hope that, as these witnesses know, we could make a clear case that the standard deduction ought to be increased. Hopefully it will be in the Republican and Democratic platform for this year. It is an opportunity for every Presidential candidate to really say that they care about the family and this is one way I think they can make their point.

Your comment where you say that you are here to tell us that "thousands of mothers working both inside and outside the home want desperately to raise their own children. If you help them find a way to do that, both working mothers and mothers at home will benefit," and I could not agree more. I almost broke out to applaud you, Ms. Burton.

Ms. **Burton**. You can do it now.

Mr. **Wolf**. I am committed to helping the people in my congressional district and this country who have to work and are working and have children and want to meet those needs, but I also think you made one of the most appealing points that I have heard since I have, quite frankly, been in the Congress. You almost sound like my wife.

Chairman Miller slipped when he said that we pay farmers not to grow and we can pay mothers at home not to work. Quite frankly, we have five children in my family. It is the hardest job in the world. We will go out sometimes to receptions and cocktail parties in Washington and people will come up and say to my wife, what do you do, and she says I am the mother of five children. Oh.

I would not be in Congress today if it had not been for the work of my wife, the hard work—she put me through law school. She was a writer-editor and I think you are right on target with what you have said and I think there has been this demeaning attitude, this attitude somehow that if you elect—and I think it should be the right of choice—and this is Mrs. Peck and she wanted to work, and that is fine.

Some might want to work only part time, 20 hours a week, but for those who want to stay at home for whatever reason, they are not to be demeaned, and I think the policies of a government should enhance them and I think we should do everything we can to cajole private enterprise to have job sharing, each person work 20 hours a week, also to have flexitime whereby if your husband works and you work one can leave early in the morning and one can leave later on.

I did not have any time with Dr. Kamerman earlier, but the U.S. Geological Survey does it in my district. It works and it works well, and you have a better employee who meets the needs of their children. I hope without asking too many questions—I had a list of things I was going to ask, and maybe I will keep them open for the record.

If this committee really wants to be bold and imaginative and creative and really be worth the money that we are spending, we should deal with both of these issues. We should help those who are working to take care of their child care needs, and help those who elect to stay home by mandating or cajoling the private enterprise to do something to help both of these groups of people.

I just want to thank all of you, the entire panel. I think you have all made excellent points. I must tell you that your point is not one that I had heard very much since I have been in this business. It really is not, and I am going to take your statement home and let my wife read it tonight.

Thank you very much.

Chairman **Miller**. I want to also thank the panel. I think this panel has raised probably some difficult questions. Some women are working out of economic necessity while others desire not to be out in the workplace but to be home. It really raises the issue of an incomes policy in this country—a question that we have sought to avoid.

This year, in the tax bill that is moving through the Congress, we are considering doubling the amount that can be contributed to IRA's. We now know that the first decision to create IRA's created very little or no new savings, that people who had it in the bank moved it to an IRA so it became tax-free. We are now going to cost the Government additional billions of dollars and the question is, I think, if we had these hearings 1 year ago, would we be doubling the contribution to the IRA?

It does not create any additional savings or income to that family during the time that they are raising children, because it can't be spent until someone is 59 or 60 years of age. Perhaps we should spend the money to deal with the standard deduction, which is directed, to some extent, to the cost of raising children?

As was pointed out by Dr. Zigler, infants are very expensive, and policies should reflect that. I can testify about adolescents—I think they get more expensive in the end. Those are among the most fundamental questions this Congress will ever address. If they are going to be raised in the context of child care policy, I welcome them. I think we will have to look at some kind of income-based policy because so many individuals get up every morning and go to work and come home at the end of the year poor.

How are the needs of those children going to get met? The alternative should not be public assistance. We need to keep them out in the work force for the productivity of this Nation, as well as the economic stability of their family.

The well-being of children and the ability of families to stay intact, the ability of families to stay off public assistance, is so important. How to ensure it is also the most difficult part of the process that we will engage in.

It is my generation, I guess, which feels most strongly that the biological clock is running. I constantly hear of women in the work force express the desire to stay home. They are about to have their first child or their second child and they must do that within the next couple of years, but the economic reality suggests that they cannot.

I think that Congressman Wolf has raised a very important point. We must look at to what extent the incomes policy in this country cuts against the welfare of children who we continue to express political concern about in terms of the future of this country.

So you are the last panel of this hearing this morning, but you have also raised, I think, clearly some of the most difficult issues that we will have to confront. I thank you very much for your testimony and for your time, and I believe, Miss Hughes, that your husband is here, right?

Yes. We want to also thank you for coming this morning.

Ms. Burton. My husband is here, too.

Chairman Miller. Where is he? Stand up.

Thank you very much for your time and your effort, and I thank the members of the committee again for their participation in this hearing.

[Whereupon, at 12:54 p.m., the committee adjourned, to reconvene upon the call of the Chair.]

[Material submitted for inclusion in the record follows:]

Prepared Statement of Jo Ann Gasper, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Social Services Policy

Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony for the record regarding child care. It is an important issue to the American family. I am Jo Ann Gasper, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Social Services Policy at the Department of Health and Human Services. I am responsible for policy development for a wide range of social service issues: children, youth, families, aging, Indians, long-term care and disability. As the mother of three children, I know from personal experience the problems, pressures and difficulties that working parents face.

Child care is an issue of immediate concern to families. Child care discussions and the development of policies to help families should recognize that parents have the primary responsibility for the rearing, care and education of their own children. This principle, which has been endorsed by Congress, is fully supported by the Administration. Although there may be differences of opinion on how to best achieve our common goal of helping families, our deliberations must acknowledge the primacy of parental responsibility, recognize that parents are the best caregivers for their children, and understand that parents are in the best position to determine what is best for their children. Policies to assist families should also provide parents with the greatest number of options and flexibility in obtaining care for their children.

We should also recognize that women work for economic reasons. Two pay checks are frequently necessary to support a family. In addition, the number of working single parent families has increased. Child care is essential for such working parents.

Although today we are discussing child care, we must also be aware of the broader issue of a family's need to provide care for other dependents including aged and declining parents and disabled family members. The same principles of family responsibility and the need to have options available also apply.

The Administration and the Department of Health and Human Services are firmly committed to strengthening the American family. Child care is essential for working parents to meet their responsibilities. In order to help families have flexibility and to be able to determine the setting and type of care for their children, we are working to encourage greater private sector involvement in child care, we have supported modifications to the dependent care deduction and we have proposed that nonprofit dependent care facilities be classified as tax-exempt organizations. The number of employer supported child care programs has increased from an estimated 105 such programs in 1978 to 415 employers reporting programs in 1982. Employer support of child care is expected to expand and the Administration will continue to encourage and assist in this effort which can offer various options to accommodate the needs of working parents. The President's Advisory Council on Private Sector Initiatives is conducting a series of luncheon meetings with businessmen to provide information on employer options for working parents, including child care assistance options.

A number of employer provided child care options have emerged for working parents. Flexitime, job sharing and part-time work are alternatives that can assist parents with their child care responsibilities. The Administration has strongly supported legislation which would promote the use of flexible and compressed work schedules by the Federal contractors and subcontractors. Information and referral services provide parents assistance in locating appropriate child care providers. Employers can also offer on-site day care and some employers also support child care through flexible benefit plans (cafeteria style plans). As employers come to realize the benefits of assisting employees with their family responsibilities-reduced staff turnover, improved staff moral, reduced absenteeism and increased productivity—employer support of child care will expand and benefit more working families. The President's Private Sector Task Force has been actively involved in promoting employer supported day care.

In discussing child care, I would like to dispel some common myths. These myths are:

1. That there is a national shortage of child care;
2. That a shortage of daycare prevents low income women from working;
3. That center care is "better" (i.e. higher quality) than care at home or in other informal settings;
4. That the Federal government is not providing adequate resources to help parents meet their child care responsibilities.

MYTH 1: THERE IS A NATIONAL SHORTAGE OF CHILD CARE

We are all familiar with the statistics on the increase in the number of working mothers. There has been a significant change from 1950, when 12% of mothers with children under six years of age were working, to 1983 when 50% of these women were working. At the same time, the number of one-parent families, usually headed by women, has risen sharply. In 1981, female headed households accounted for 9.0 million or about 15 percent of all families in this country. In 1960, female headed households account for only 9.3% of all families.

Proponents of expansion of Federal support of child care usually cite these statistics and contrast them with the slight increase in the number of licensed child care slots and argue that there is a shortage of child care. This is not appropriate. By looking only at the number of "licensed" child care slots to determine the supply of child care is to assume that the tip of the iceberg is all that there is. The majority of children receive care in informal settings. Since informal care can be in the parent's home, in the home of a relative or friend, or in a family day care setting, it is impossible to calculate the number of such "slots". We also know that for many families, parents provide for their children themselves by working on different shifts, using flexitime and part-time employment.

This is not to say that it is "easy" for parents to find the type of care they want for their child or children. Parents frequently experience difficulties with child care arrangements. However, these are usually not supply problems—they are usually problems of finding the particular type of child care that best meets their needs at the right time and at the right price.

Parents may experience difficulty in their local community finding the exact type of child care that they desire. Most parents have to chose child care with which they are reasonably satisfied, but which is not exactly what they would like to have. In my own experience, I've tried various child care arrangements—family care, center care and in-home care. None has been fully satisfactory to me. The preference problem is a difficulty which faces virtually all working parents and requires that parents make extra efforts. However, it is not solvable by methods which simply increase the supply of child care slots.

There are things that can be done at the local level and by employers to make it easier for parents to find the kind of care they want. I've already described the options available to employers—and this should include public employers too. The

Social Service Block Grant [SSBG] provides States with a large degree of flexibility in identifying and meeting the needs of their citizens. Child care services are funded in virtually every State under the SSBG. Policies that promote "cottage industries" and at-home work can assist many families, allowing parents, usually mothers to remain at home with children while working and earning an income. Increased use of informal care is another option. Existing information and referral systems can be more fully utilized to help parents identify the type of care that is appropriate to their needs.

MYTH 2: A SHORTAGE OF CHILD CARE KEEPS LOW INCOME WOMEN FROM WORKING (A SHORTAGE KEEPS WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN POVERTY)

There is no clear evidence to support the notion that the lack of child care prevents women, especially welfare mothers, from working who otherwise would do so. There is also no clear evidence that there is a shortage of "affordable" child care. Researchers for the Seattle and Denver Income Maintenance Experiments (SIME/DIME] concluded that since low income families utilize inexpensie or free informal arrangements, provision of free services had no impact on their modes of care or on employment.

Furthermore, in analysis of the 1979 AFDC Recipient Survey, (Hoffereth and Sonenstein, 1983) it was found that over half of the working welfare mothers of children under 14 were not receiving either a work expense disregard or a title XX subsidy. It is believed that a substantial number of mothers find care for their children which is either free or of minimal cost.

In addition, only four percent of unemployed women surveyed by the Census Bureau in June 1982 stated that they had turned down a job offer in the last month because of difficulties in arranging child care (O'Connell and Rodgers, 1983).

MYTH 3: CENTER CARE IS "BETTER"

People tend to use the terms day care and center care interchangably, implying that center care is the only kind of day care or the best kind of care. However, there is no clear evidence that center care is better than informal child care arrangements (care in the child's home or in someone else's home). In fact, there is some evidence (National Infant Care Study) that informal care is better for infants than formal center care.

Recent census information shows that a very small percent of children under five with working mothers are cared for in a day care center. Only 13 percent are cared for in a day care center. Slightly more than half of these children are cared for by a relative and the remaining 30 percent family care or in-home care. To some extent, this must reflect parents' choices in the type and quality of care they want their children to receive. And, most opinion survey report a generally high level of parent satisfication with their day care arrangements.

MYTH 4: THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS NOT PROVIDING ADEQUATE SUPPORT FOR CHILD CARE

The Federal government provides support for child care in a number of ways and Federal funding of child care activities has increased 60 percent since 1980. In FY 1980, total support for child care amounted to $2.6 billion. In FY 1984 we expect that support to increase to $4.2 billion. Federal government support for child care includes:

Funding to the States under the Social Services Block Grant;
The AFDC disregard of work-related expenses;
The dependent care tax credit;
The tax exclusion of employer provided child care;
The child care feeding program; and the Head Start program.

Much of the increase is due to the Administration supported changes in 1981 which created a sliding scale for the dependent care tax credit and almost doubled the maximum credit. The Administration has proposed to restructure the tax credit to further increase the tax credit available to low-income working families.

The Social Services Block Grant provides States with greater service and program flexibility to determine the needs of their citizens and to provide services that were provided under the former title XX program it replaced. Historically, States used approximately 20% of title XX program funding for day care services. We have no reason to believe that States are not continuing to devote block grant funds to day care services. Preliminary results from a current study shows that between 1981 and 1983, of 18 States randomly selected and surveyed, 8 increased Federal and

State spending for day care and 2 retained current funding levels. The remaining 8 retained service levels by using the income disregard under AFDC or lowering unit costs.

The Head Start program continues to provide comprehensive developmental services to low-income pre-school children. The Head Start budget has increased from $735 million FY 1980 to $996 million in FY 1984. This has allowed a major expansion in the number of children served to 430,000 in FY 1984, nearly a 20 percent increase over the same period. Although Head Start is not a day care program, it does provide child care and pre-school development services that benefit disadvantaged poor children.

Approximately 10 percent of Head Start children attend six or more hours per day.

The Administration supports provisions of the Federal tax code that provide child care tax incentives to employers and employees. The Child Care Tax Credit allows parents to claim up to 30 percent of their child care expenses on their Federal income tax. For the first time, the 1984 tax return allows working families to claim the tax credit on the short tax form, allowing families with limited incomes and who did not itemize deductions to claim the credit for child care work related expenses. Because of changes supported by the Administration, the value of child care assistance provided by employers can now be treated as a tax free benefit for employees. The Administration is proposing the credit be increased for low-income working families.

In conclusion, I believe there are many myths about the status of child care in this country. These myths have become the basis of an argument for expanded Federal involvement in the provision of child care. Any policies directed at assisting families must take into account certain fundamental principles and understand the broader issues of family responsibility for the care of its members. Families are already assisted through a number of Federal supports which provide significant assistance in meeting their responsibilities. A categorical Federal program for child care is not appropriate nor necessary. Existing Federal child care supports, tax assistance, expanded employer roles in child care and more local approaches to child care will help families with child care responsibilities.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF BONNIE WISEMAN

I need full time babysitting help on a flexible hours basis.

I am career military in a job with no possibility of normal dayworking hours. My husband is also a shift worker at another military base and our hours would not allow us to share babysitting between us. We are both in supervisory jobs with fixed hours per shift.

The economy, job benefits are why I continue to work.

The military gave me one month leave and then I had to have a babysitter. My work does not care anything about the care I find for my child. It's my problem and not theirs. They told me to handle the problem of child care by myself or get out of the military. They couldn't help me and had no suggestions.

There are no military care centers for shift workers. They all close some time in the evening.

I called Fairfax County and Northern Virginia Family Day Care Association and received listings of care providers and called. Most women would not take infants or their quota was already filled. On the few with openings, they said no to shifts and weekends.

The first couple weeks I took my son to a co-workers home that is way below health and safety standards. I was afraid for my son and finally found another sitter for shifts 28 miles away at Bolling Air Force Base.

After a few months the base commander said she could no longer babysit until she got a doctor's o.k.

My son now goes to a sitter across the street on days with a backup sitter on the next block over. On shifts I am taking him to another co-worker's home at Bolling Air Force Base. This is out of my normal way to and from work by several miles.

My son is getting good care now but it is still inconvenient and excessively time consuming.

We have been blessed by our son being very happy and adjustable to all the different sitters and hours.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PATRICIA MALTZ, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF QUALITY CHILD CARE, INC.

Patricia Maltz is my name. I am the chief executive officer of Quality Child Care, Inc. I appreciate the opportunity to provide specific information to the members of the Select Committee on Children. I know that many of you have been very supportive of the issues surrounding family day care and child care in general over the past years. We have appreciated the leadership contributed on behalf of family day care and look forward to the continuing commitment.

As an organization, Quality Child Care is nearing the completion of its 11th year of conducting business. We are a nonprofit, tax-exempt organization that provides services to family day care providers and the children they serve. Among other things, those services include training, bonus commodity distribution, sponsorship of the Child Care Food Program, administration of abuse and neglect intervention programs, and most recently, we have begun an involvement in providing family day care to teenage moms in the state of Illinois through the Ounce of Prevention program.

Our involvement in the sponsorship of the Child Care Food Program for family day care began five years ago in Minnesota. We have grown in our services to our present level which is providing sponsorship to family day care in eight states. Minnesota is our first and largest state. Our smallest state is Connecticut with Texas being our newest state celebrating one year this month. The following chart identifies by state the number of providers we currently serve, the number of children in those homes receiving the benefits of the Child Care Food Program and the monthly reimbursement being paid out to the providers.

	Number of providers currently served	Number of children	Total monthly reimbursement
State:			
Minnesota	3,600	26,800	$567,000
North Dakota	1,000	7,200	151,000
Wisconsin	700	4,400	92,000
Nebraska	540	4,500	105,000
Illinois	800	5,300	127,000
Massachusetts	530	2,700	65,000
Connecticut	450	2,400	60,000
Texas	680	3,800	124,000

As you can see, we currently serve 8,300 family day care providers. These providers serve over 57,000 children on a monthly basis. The average monthly reimbursement is $1.2 million. According to the most recent information that we have been able to gather, we continue to maintain the position of being the largest sponsor of family day care in the nation. The USDA indicates that 63,700 homes are currently participating across the nation. Quality Child Care, Inc. sponsors 13 percent.

I'd like to share our philosophy of sponsoring the Child Care Food Program. We believe that the benefits of the program should not be limited only to those providers residing in densely populated areas such as Minneapolis, St. Paul, Omaha, Chicago or Minot. We believe we have a responsibility to serve providers throughout entire states. As a result, our services are available border to border in every state we operate in. The only exception is in Wisconsin where another sponsor was already serving 12 counties. We agreed not to actively outreach in those 12 counties but serve the remaining counties in the state of Wisconsin. While this philosophy is costly in terms of use of limited administrative dollars in a time of ever-increasing administrative burdens, we are committed to responding to the needs of children in family day care across all areas of a state.

In addition to the sponsorship of the Child Care Food Program for family day care providers, another key component related to the Child Care Food Program is the distribution of the bonus commodities—primarily butter and cheese and occasionally honey and other periodically selected bonus items. We have been distributing the butter and cheese throughout all of our states for about a year. We have found the responsiveness of children and providers to the program has been overwhelming. An average of 85 percent of our providers participate in the bonus commodity distribution program. A side note: I recently visited with a QCCI field staff person in one of the agricultural areas of Minnesota. As we passed the local implement dealer, she shared with me that children frequently ask her during her visits to the family day care homes when they will get some more of that "John Deere cheese!"

Prior to my accepting the position of executive director and subsequently chief executive officer of Quality Child Care, I cared for children in my home as a licensed family day care provider in the state of Minnesota. I provided this care for a period of three years. During that time, the number of children that I cared for were five preschoolers including my own two preschoolers and two school-age children, one who attended kindergarten and the other first grade. As I am now in the 13th year of my professional career in the field of family day care, I believe that I can offer several things. A historical perspective of family day care, views of providers I meet and work with on a very regular basis, plus a focus on the national policy of child care and the role that family day care plays.

Family day care has and always will be the major care provider of children in this nation. My statement is based on the definition of family day care as being the individual who cares for children from more that one family while the parents are at work or school. My definition does not include a requirement that providers be regulated. National studies indicate that for every family day care provider who is regulated in some manner by state regulations or federal certification there are six to ten individuals who are not regulated. While we have made some inroads into the regulation of caregivers, we are a long way from full regulation of this service industry in this nation. What it has to sell to parents is flexibility in providing care for their children, newborn to generally age 10 and often age 12. Parents, be they single heads of households or not, need care for their children so they can support their family.

There are many dimensions to the service of family day care. They include flexibility of times that family day care is available; the willingness of family day care providers to serve lunch twice every day when they agree to care for two kindergarten children, one who attends morning kindergarten and one who attends afternoon kindergarten; and providing care for the child who comes early in the morning, eats breakfast, goes off to school and returns after the school day, has a snack and is supervised during the remainder of the afternoon until the parents arrive back from work. Additionally, that provider cares for that school-age child full-time on any school holidays and in Minnesota on any snow days, plus often cares for that child during the summer when full-time care is again required. Many providers do the basic toilet training for children when they are ready. Providers tell me they also train the parents. They provide the opportunity for learning various skills that are appropriate for the ages of the children, i.e. large and small motor, cognitive, conceptual, language. Many providers work with children who have learning disabilities. Many providers give basic parenting education to first-time parents who do not have another support group such as extended family members to help them in the very important job of parenting.

As we move through the 80s and into the 90s, family day care will continue to play an ever-increasing valuable role in how this nation cares for its children. We see increasing numbers of single-parent families. We see an increasing demand for child care services. The combination of these items is going to put a continued stress on family day care in being responsive in its services, but more importantly on who will enter the profession of family day care. The question becomes, "What incentives are there for me to choose to be a family day care provider?" As an organization, Quality Child Care will be competing with the many other occupations in this nation for our shrinking pool of available workers. We are on the cutting edge of making decisions about what enhancements need to be available in family day care to invite people into the career of caring for children. All of us in this room have a very serious responsibility to be considering the question of "Who's going to care for our children?" This is particularly important as we struggle to remain economically healthy as a nation based on our ability to produce, be it industrial, be it information, be it services. That success will be directly tied to our ability to care for our children. Family day care is the key.

In terms of the day-to-day activities of family day care, providers generally care for three to five children. They often begin work between 6:00 and 6:30 a.m. The day officially ends, in terms of their relationship with the children, between 5:30 and 6:00 p.m. That does not mean the end of the family day care duties as there is always washing to be done, food to be prepared, bathroom toilets to be cleaned and a house to be picked up. A provider's Staturdays are spent buying groceries and replenishing supplies, such as paper and crayons and those kinds of things, and watching for good buys at garage sales for toys. Occasionally you are off at a workshop getting some additional training in the areas of how to communicate with parents or good nutrition or program activities or how kids learn. I know of no other industry where the long hours put in by providers is the standard for people in the industry.

How do we maintain a strong family day care network? It's important to explore why people enter family day care. When people choose to begin a career in family day care, it's often made for very different reasons than what you and I might think. My personal experience is that the reason I became a family day care provider is I had a baby, and my girlfriend up the street also had a baby. She needed someone to care for her child. She knew how to type and I didn't. I agreed to take care of her child as long as I was going to be home with my own. Additionally, I had a three-year-old son who needed playmates. I thought, "Well, as long as I'm going to be here with two babies, I might as well have a playmate or two for my son, and I'll earn a little extra money to help supplement my family income." This story is similar to the reasons that I hear time and time again of why providers care for children. This is why the majority of nonregulated family day care occurs in this nation and will continue to occur. These individuals do not pay taxes on their family day care income, have access to information and training on child care and are not inspected for health and safety.

How do providers get into a regulated system? It doesn't happen easily. We have learned from experience most people's reaction to being licensed or registered is "I don't want the welfare department in my home." The next reaction is, "I make parents pay in cash because I don't want to pay taxes." Parents in these homes are denied accessd to the dependent care tax credit as they won't have any care if they report the credit. These two reasons represent why people choose to stay outside of any regulatory system.

As we began the Child Care Food Program sponsorship for family day care, some very interesting things happened. People who otherwise had not been involved in licensing began to enter the roles. In 1978 we had a slight growth in the number of providers from about 6,000 to a little over 6,500. Today, in Minnesota there are over 9,000 family day care providers.

When I would get calls from the state director of licensing with statements like, "We had a 300 percent increase in the number of requests for licensure in a particular county—I wonder what's going on," I did not mention the benefits of the Child Care Food Program; however, I knew from my field staff that the reason people were getting licensed was because they would then have access to the financial support of the Child Care Food Program. It has been the primary incentive for people to become part of a regulated system. Other incentives include the ability to deduct your family day care expenses. You must declare your income whether or not you are meeting the law. The other reason for providers to be licensed in access to group liability insurance programs is to cover the exposures incurred while caring for children in their home. As you can well imagine, the liability exposure in conducting a business of caring for small children in your personal home is great. The insurance companies are very hesitant to do so because it is a private residence, children are involved, and there is no monitoring by outside agencies. When you are part of a regulated system, you have access to group policies at a reasonable cost. The Child Care Food Program combined with the bonus commodities, the income tax ability and the insurance availability have become the three major reasons for an individual who care for children in his/her home to move into system and stop operating under ground. Other benefits occur when caregiver move from "underground" into the regulated group. The key to achieving economic stability of this nation is that parents who need care can find people who care for children. A young parent in a new community does not know where to find child care for her/his infant. Family day care is the care providers for infants and toddlers in this nation. If it's underground, you can't find it. When it's part of the system, we at least know where to refer parents. The second major societal benefit is that family day care providers who are regulated provide a much safer environment for children. This occurs because generally inspections are made of the facilities, providers receive training on health and safety for their day care children and providers are more aware of the needs of children.

As a service industry, I believe family day care will face several challenges in the remainder of the 80s.

1. Recruitment of new providers
2. Regulations
3. How consumers access the service
4. Continued refinement of the actual services provided

These challenges will be met by the many groups composed of providers or supporters of the industry. As necessary, this effort will, I'm sure, approach the Congress for support on various issues as they crystallize.

However, there is a role that the Congress must play today. Recognition of the role the family day care industry plays in our nation's economic achievements is important and necessary. Without the responsive, flexible care which family day care is able to provide, parents are not able to be employed and, therefore, not contributing to the economy. As a result issues such as:

1. Information and referral;
2. Tax incentives to become a provider;
3. Tax credits allowing parents to choose family day care;
4. Opposition to restrictive zoning, fire, permitted use and building codes;
5. Support for the Child Care Food Program; and
6. Jobs training programs;

must be addressed from the broadest perspective of how will these continue to support parents in their gainful employment. Realistically, I believe family day care will continue with or without anyone's support. I believe our commitment needs to be to a system where parents can find care in places convenient to them, with providers who recognize the developmental needs of children as well as their health and safety at a cost that is affordable. It is a delicate balancing act! At any point we can be faced with child pornography situations, child abuse, over-crowded homes and parents without choices.

EUROPE'S INNOVATIVE FAMILY POLICIES [1]

(By Sheila B. Kamerman and Alfred J. Kahn [2]

Until recently, most discussion of trends and developments in work and family life assumed that the two worlds were separate. This mythical separation has persisted because, in most families, the man has assumed responsibility for work while the woman remained in charge of home and family life. The pattern of segregated sex roles has changed dramatically over the past two decades throughout the industrialized world as more and more women, especially married women with children, have entered the labor market. Recognition of a changed reality did not occur suddenly. Indeed, discussion in the 1960s tended to fasten on only one component: the changing roles of women as they added work outside the home to their responsibilities within the home.

The focus was broadened in the 1970s to include some recognition of the systemic nature of this change, and the problem was redefined to include the changing roles of men as well. Now in the 1980s, it has become urgent to address a far more profound question: what is to be the nature of the relationship between work and family life when most adults, regardless of sex, are increasingly likely to be in the labor force?

Discussion of this question began first in several European countries, where women entered the workforce in large numbers earlier than in the United States. However, the subject is receiving growing attention in this country because, for the first time, more than half the adult women, including more than 60 percent of the mothers, work. More than 68 percent of mothers of school-aged children, 59 percent of mothers of children aged three to five, and 48 percent of mothers of children below the age of three were in the labor force in 1984, and the rates are still rising. The most common family type in the United States today is the two-parent, two-wage-earner family. If the large number of single-parent families in which the parent works are added to this group, the dimensions of the issue become clear.

The United States is now beginning to recognize the significance of the implications of this major change. A related development is the significant decline in the birth rate in all industrialized countries. If women who work are also expected to have children, the tension between work and family life must be lessened.

THE EMERGING AGENDA

Perhaps the first noteworthy development is the emergence of a list of concerns common to most industrialized countries:

The need for some financial assistance for working parents.

The need to care for children while parents are at work.

---

[1] This is an update of an article published in *Translated Perspectives*, a publication of the German Marshall Fund of the United States, in March, 1980. A full report of the study on which the original article was based can be found in, Sheila B. Kamerman and Alfred J. Kahn, *Children, Family Benefits, and Working Parents* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981).

[2] Professors of Social Policy and Planning.

The need to make possible a more equitable sharing between men and women of family responsibilities.

The need to help adults find a better balance between work and home so that they may fulfill their roles as parents without suffering penalties in the labor market.

This article reports on the first two areas.

CHILDREN: SOCIETY'S RESOURCE AND RESPONSIBILITY

European countries have a long history of acknowledging that children are a major societal resource and responsibility. Cash benefits provided to families with children are increasingly referred to as a "family benefit system," part of a country's overall social security system but distinguishable from traditional social insurance and social assistance.

For several decades, many European countries have been providing family or child allowances—cash benefits provided monthly (or, weekly) for every child (or second or subsequent children)—generally regardless of the income and work status of the parents. These allowances began in France in the 1930s; Sweden, Finland, and several other countries made them available in the 1940s. By now, 67 countries, including all the developed countries except the United States, provide such a benefit. Usually tax free, the benefits range in the European countries between 5 and 10 percent (where there is one child) of median wage and even higher in cases of larger families.

An alternative approach is to provide a similar child benefit through the tax system. Unlike the $1,000 tax exemption for dependents in the United States (many countries have such exemptions), of value only to those who pay taxes and of more value to those with higher incomes, the child benefit tax credit is a fixed amount, available to families at all income levels. Furthermore, it is refundable to those whose incomes are so low as to preclude any tax obligations.

Most European countries have developed two parallel policies to protect family income at the time of childbirth in families with working mothers. First, there is a guarantee of a right to leave work for a minimum of three months (the Netherlands and several other countries), a maximum of three years (Hungary), and an average of six months to one year, with assurance of full job protection, seniority, and pension entitlement. In one country, Sweden, this right can be shared equally by both parents. In several other countries, such as Finland and Norway, fathers may share in a portion of this parental benefit.

The second, parallel policy is the provision of a cash benefit that replaces the full wage covered under social security (or a significant portion of it, or some combination of full wage followed by a smaller flat rate benefit.) These benefits are available to almost all employed women and under certain circumstances—or in certain countries, such as Sweden—to their husbands also. The benefits may be tax free or considered as taxable income.

In most countries the right to leave work and retain job protection covers a longer period of time than does the cash benefit. In some countries an unpaid parenting leave supplements the right to a paid maternity leave. Sometimes, as in France, the supplementary, unpaid leave is available to either parent but the cash benefit covering the immediate pre- and post-childbirth leave is available only to the mother.

In effect, these two parallel policies constitute the statutory provision of maternity or parental benefits and leaves. The key is the job-protected leave from work combined with a cash benefit that replaces earnings lost at the time of childbirth. In France, this covers 16 weeks, including six weeks before childbirth, and is equal to full wage replacement. In Germany, six months are covered, 14 weeks with a statutory flat rate benefit equal to the wage of about half the working women, but supplemented to full wage by the employer for those women earning more. The remainder of the time is at the statutory benefit level only. Hungary provides full wage replacement for 20 weeks of maternity leave.

The German Democratic Republic covers 26 weeks plus an additional 26 (for a total of 52) at the birth of second and subsequent children. Sweden is unique in providing a benefit that covers nine months,[3] is available to either parent, and can be prorated so that parents can use the benefit to cover full-time, half-time, or three-quarter-time work while children are young; this enables parents to share child care responsiblities for the child's first year or year and a half.

Hungary provides an unusual benefit from the end of maternity leave until the child is three: the mother is entitled to a cash allowance equal to about 40 percent of the average wage for women as long as she remains at home to care for her child. During this time she maintains her seniority and pension entitlements, and is assured of job protection.

---

[3] An additional 3 months is available at a minimum flat rate benefit.

These benefits are contingent on prior work record and represent some attempt by society to replace earnings at childbirth and for some period thereafter, when, it is assumed, a parent needs to be at home to provide critical child care. There is an increasing tendency to extend these rights to both of the parents and to adoptive parents as well. Another, related, trend is to provide a cash benefit and a right to leave work for a specified number of days for a working parent who must care for a young child who is ill at home.

The benefits so far discussed supplement the incomes of parents with growing children, or replace income in the period right after childbirth. Few countries provide a substitute for earned income beyond the time a child is three, and the scale and scope of Aid to Families With Dependent Children in the United States is rare. Canada and Britain have the closest equivalents to the U.S. system.

CHILD CARE SERVICES [4]

Paid leaves from work following childbirth range from three months to three years. A six-month leave is typical in most countries, with growing discussion about extending the leave to nine months or to a maximum of one year.

Although all European countries permit unpaid, job-protected leaves, few women avail themselves of this benefit, for obvious reasons. As a result, most working families in Europe need some form of out-of-home child care service beginning when a child is about six months of age. Compulsory school attendance usually begins at age six, as it does in the United States; but in Britain five is the age of entry while in the Scandinavian countries, seven.

For the typical working family in Europe, all-day, out-of-home child care services are needed for children aged about six months to six years. What kind of care is provided for these children now?

Most children aged three to six attend a free public preschool covering the normal school day; they attend it on a voluntary basis regardless of whether they have working mothers.

France has the most extensive such provision in Europe, serving almost all children aged three to six. Moreover, about 40 percent of the two-year-olds (largely those aged two and a half) attend, also. (Hungary and Germany recently opened kindergarten to two-year-olds as space became available.)

Belgium has a similar program. Germany serves about 75 percent of its three- to six-year-olds in such a program although most children attend school for only half a day (8:00–1:00) as in all primary schools in Germany. Italy has space for about 70 percent of the age group. Most Eastern European countries serve 75 to 90 percent of the group in full-day preschool programs, with the highest rate of inclusion in the German Democratic Republic. Coverage is relatively low in Sweden; but more than half the three- to six-year-olds there attend child care programs, which, in contrast to other countries, are part of a free-standing program that is independent of the public education of health care systems.

Most of Europe assumes that children from age three (and increasingly from age two and a half or two) will attend preschool because the experience is good for them regardless of whether their mothers work. The child care function is an incidental benefit. Thus, for most working families in Europe, child care is available for preschoolers at least through the normal school day.

Only the United States, Britain, Canada, and Israel maintain an artificial distinction between child care under social welfare and educational auspices; and only these countries continue to support two parallel systems for children under compulsory school age. In Israel about 90 percent of three- to five-year-olds already attend a preschool program in any case. These are largely under private auspices, as they are in the United States, where about 60 percent of the children of this age group now attend such programs.

---

[4] No systematic child care survey has been carried out in these European countries since our study was completed at the end of the 1970's. However, reports from the countries suggest that there has been little significant change in coverage rates since then. Where changes have been reported, the data have been incorporated in the revised text.

We would note, however, that while European female labor force participation rates have remained relatively stable in the 1980's, or increased only modestly, rates in the U.S., especially for married women with preschool-aged children, have continued to rise.

DAY CARE PROGRAMS

Except for Sweden and Finland, which have one child care program for all children up to age seven, Europe largely defines day care as a program for children under age three. Most countries administer day care programs under health ministry or department auspices. Infant and toddler care is nowhere near as extensive as is care for children from about the age two or three on.

The German Democratic Republic has by far the most extensive provision for this group, with 60 percent of children between the ages of six months and three years in care (44 percent of children from birth to age three). The country plans to expand provision to include space for 70 percent. Between 12 and 15 children are in each group with a ratio of one staff member to six children. (Officially recommended ratios are higher.)

France has the most extensive provision among the Western European countries, with about a third of children under age three in some kind of out-of-home care. The public preschool programs serve most two-year-olds with working mothers, and another small percentage is served in publicly-subsidized day care centers. The largest group is cared for by licensed family day care mothers; France has the most extensive provision of this type of care of any country.

Hungary has only a limited amount of group care; its primary policy for infants and toddlers is to subsidize their mothers' own care. In contrast, Sweden has an official policy of expanding such coverage to meet most existing needs. However, only about 14 percent of children under age three can be served in publicly-subsidized care today, while an equivalent percentage are still cared for in private, informal, family day care arrangements.

Thus, most countries still have a long way to go before there are enough out-of-home places to care for children aged six months to three years.

Before- and after-school care for preschool and primary school children, when school hours and school days do not coincide with work schedules, is recognized as a universal need. No country provides adequate coverage or even has systematic data indicating how children of this age are cared for now. Such programs are important; their scarcity represents a significant gap in child care services.

FAMILY AND WORKPLACE RESPONSES

This review does not cover intrafamilial adaptation or workplace responses to the new realities of work and family life. For some years, however, policies in many countries have supported, or been predicated on, traditional role assignments within the family. Modifications will be necessary to increase intrafamilial equity.

Most adaptation in the home will reflect the values and behavioral changes of the adults living there. There is some evidence, particularly for younger adults, that men now are sharing more home and family responsibilities with their working wives.

The workplace itself remains an essential arena for change in terms of marketplace and statutory benefits and the organization of work. A number of countries are examining the social security status of women (in the workforce, homemakers, widows). Sweden's parent insurance is a major innovation. Among countries allowing post-childbirth leaves, France offers a two-year leave for either parent under certain circumstances; Norway provides a parental leave of up to one year. Sweden permits an unpaid leave, after conclusion of the parent insurance benefit, until a child is 18 months of age, and guarantees parents the right to work three-quarter time (a six-hour day) until their child is age eight. Assuring workers the right to take off a certain number of days to care for an ill child at home, or to visit a child in school, is also receiving attention in Europe.

Of particular importance are the efforts by industry to modify employment practices or to provide selected benefits through labor contracts or as part of private fringe benefit systems. Flexitime is now an established policy in most large and medium-sized firms in Northern Europe. There is growing experimentation with other alternative work schedules, including part-time work and shared work in several countries.

THE NEED FOR A POLICY STRATEGY

If adults are to manage their work and family lives simultaneously, attention will have to be paid to all areas discussed above.

A major European development is the trend toward family or child policy packages that go far beyond any single policy. The European experience suggests the need for a strategy that includes income transfers, child care services, and employment policies as central elements.

Employment and labor market policies are a cornerstone of social policy in industrialized countries. Work is a primary role and a central ethic for all adults. Unless it is possible for adults to manage their work and family lives without undue strain on themselves and their children, society will suffer a significant loss in productivity, and an even more significant loss in the quantity and quality of future generations.

○